This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

YC 39414

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Class

CHILDREN OF THE STATE

Children of the State

BY

FLORENCE DAVENPORT-HILL

EDITED BY

FANNY FOWKE

Second Edition—Revised and Enlarged

LONDON
MACMILLAN AND CO.
AND NEW YORK
1889

All rights reserved

HV837
.G5H6

READING ROOM

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

A SECOND preface seems peculiarly needful to a second edition which contains comparatively little of the original book. Changes of conditions in various directions made a complete rearrangement of the subject imperative, and rendered it necessary to cut out some passages no longer relevant; most of the historical portion has, however, been retained. Though we trust that many abuses and mistakes thus recorded now belong only to history, we considered it better to reproduce them, as illustrative of the difficulties which characterise Poor Law administration in Great Britain and Ireland.

Increased opportunities of study have shown us that the scheme of Boarding-out pauper children which we advocate is not the kindly invention of a sect of English philanthropists, as is the usual impression—'the toy of a few benevolent ladies and gentlemen,' which could not be applied to any great number; but that it is the dominant system in many countries. A fuller account of foreign methods, and the introduction of other new matter, have made

213164

a considerable enlargement unavoidable. In order, however, to keep the book within due limits, we have given but a very slight sketch of many important organisations, and have been obliged to omit much interesting detail. Readers who wish for fuller and more minute information are referred to the large and increasing literature on Pauper Education in general, and Boarding-out in particular. We would specify the *Annual Reports of the Local Government Board;* those of the different Colonial Departments dealing with State children (Trübner & Co., Ludgate Hill); and the *Leaflets* issued from time to time by the Association for the Advancement of Boarding-out (Assistant Secretary, Office of the Association, 22 Berners Street) as peculiarly valuable.

We desire here to offer our heartfelt thanks to the many friends, at home and abroad, who have so kindly helped us with their advice and knowledge; especially to those Poor Law administrators who, under the stress of heavy and absorbing duties, have yet found, or made, time to show us the working of some institution, to write letters of special information, or to examine and verify the statistics we have submitted to them.

We are thankful, too, to record that some of the early workers mentioned in the first edition are still spared, and we trust may be interested in the following pages. But this retrospect is necessarily a sad one. Some, indeed, have been called away while we have been preparing this book; the band of

pioneers constantly needs recruits, and if reading what we have written should move any to interest themselves in the wide and important field of pauper education, we shall feel that our labours have been richly rewarded. For their encouragement we would add that the work of reclaiming dependent and delinquent children, though slow and arduous, is hopeful. We trust that an age which has discovered the great value of 'waste' in many departments of human industry, which even manufactures useful articles from the refuse of coal tar, may devote its energies to organising different methods of turning its waste humanity into good citizenship. For we do not believe that our great Empire has yet touched the limit of her resources, or that she will ever become unable to support her vast and yet growing family, if only she will bring up its members to be capable and self-dependent.

THE EDITOR.

February, 1889.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

THE style of the following little treatise may perhaps reveal that it was begun with a view to insertion in a Review or Magazine. As it advanced, however, I found myself compelled to choose between exceeding the limits I had prescribed to myself, or failing in great part to use the information courteously afforded me from many quarters; and the importance and interest, as it seemed to me, of this information, gathered from foreign countries as well as our own, and derived in almost every instance from the highest authorities on the subject to which it refers, decided me to lengthen my undertaking in order to avail myself of the material I had been so fortunate as to obtain. For the extreme kindness with which my informants have answered my applications, often addressed to those to whom I was an entire stranger, I desire to express my cordial thanks.

FLORENCE HILL.

December 31st, 1867.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
1.	INTRODUCTORY	1
2.	THE WORKHOUSE AS HOME AND SCHOOL	13
3.	SEPARATE AND DISTRICT SCHOOLS, ON THE BARRACK, BLOCK, AND COTTAGE HOMES SYSTEMS	45
4.	STATE AID AND INDIVIDUAL HELP—CERTIFIED AND UNCERTIFIED HOMES—EMIGRATION [TO CANADA]	101
5.	BOARDING-OUT IN IRELAND AND SCOTLAND	141
6.	BOARDING-OUT IN ENGLAND	175
7.	STATE CHILDREN IN THE UNITED STATES	215
8.	EXPERIENCE OF THE COLONIES	232
9.	STATE CHILDREN IN FOREIGN LANDS	273
10.	OUT-DOOR PAUPER CHILDREN AND INS AND OUTS	305
11.	CONCLUSION	324

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

'It is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish.'

'The family . . . property and law are the first steps of man's freedom.' —B. BOSANQUET.

ONE of the most striking and significant contrasts between ancient and modern thought is the difference of attitude towards the past and the future which characterises those periods. While the ancients ever looked backwards with wistful longing to a golden age, set in the mists of a legendary past, the moderns have reversed the process, and yearn towards a glowing future, confidently entrusting the realisation of their ideals to the time which is to come. This change of thought has brought with it a corresponding change of action, and different modes of social life. Nowhere is its effect more apparent than in the treatment of children. It marks the advance of religion from the worship of exacting ancestors needing to be propitiated by sacrifice, even in the tomb, to the recognition that man's highest duties are to the living, and to those who shall come after him. The work of faith is now no longer to glorify the past; it is the more laborious but cheerful task to benefit the present, and to take an enlightened care for the future.

These nobler aspirations received a fresh and lasting impulse when Christ took the little ones under his sheltering care and began a new era for child life. Christianity has

inspired a recognition of the rights of children which they are themselves too helpless to enforce; it has quickened the sense of responsibility in parents, while it makes all willing to sacrifice time and thought for the young, since on them we build our trust in slow but certain progress. And this acknowledgment of the children gave also its real value and significance to the family; for while it lost its ancient religious and political importance it gained in sacredness and purity, and in the mutual dependence and duty of its members. Family life in its true sense, and individual freedom, had been alike impossible when the claims and commands of the State dominated every other duty.

But though the action of the State has been much restricted by the growth of individual responsibility and the enlarging of individual liberty, she has yet to regulate many social conditions, and must interfere when private duties are neglected which ought to be performed without prompting. For our present purpose we have only to deal with her relation to children. If these should be left without natural protectors, she has to assume parental authority over them; and if they should be also destitute, she must provide for them maintenance and education until she deems them old enough to fend for themselves. There are also children over whom, although their parents are still living, the State must, for their good and for that of the community, exercise an absolute authority. While still another class, being partly supported by the State, are of right partly under her control.

Of all in this category it is the children (1) who are parentless and destitute; (2) deserted; (3) having parents unable to support them; (4) having parents able only to support them partially, with whom we are specially concerned, since these classes include all who fall under the care of the guardians of the poor. But under the designation 'Children of the State' may now be numbered many to whom the name was not applied twenty years ago, when this book was first published, and in later pages we shall have occasion to glance rapidly at the other classes it may now embrace. It must be remembered that *destitution* is

the sole ground for affording poor relief; insomuch that however anxious to rescue children from being badly brought up by parents or other relatives, guardians would not be legally justified in interfering with them, notwithstanding that they may have reason to apprehend that they will be brought up to a life of immorality.[1]

The number of pauper children in England and Wales on the 1st of January 1888 was 268,369. Of these 55,456 were receiving indoor and 212,913 (including 3551 boarded out) outdoor relief. Of the indoor children 33,605 were orphans or other children relieved without their parents, 7253 the illegitimate children of inmates, 10,700 children of able-bodied inmates, 3898 children of not able-bodied inmates.

Of the 212,913 receiving outdoor relief, 118,976, or considerably more than half, were dependent on widowed mothers, 10,699 were orphans or other children relieved without their parents, 24,105 were children of parents not able-bodied, 44,823 were resident with able-bodied fathers who had obtained relief, 711 were illegitimate children with their mothers, 3228 were relieved on account of their parents being in gaol, 303 were children of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and 10,068 were children of other non-resident fathers.[2] Thus we see that the child paupers of England and Wales exceed a quarter of a million, and constitute considerably over one-third of the pauperism of the country.

We are then able to realise how important is the inquiry as to the provision the State makes for the teaching and maintenance of these children, for nearly 45,000 of whom, being orphans, she is entirely responsible; and what manner of men and women they are who grow up under her care.

Authority over the children of the State is, of course, primarily derived from the Legislature; it is regulated by the government department, which deals with paupers—formerly called the Poor Law Board, but since 1871, owing to an increase of duties and powers, designated the Local

[1] *General Consolidated Order of July* 1847, Art. 215, No. 6, note c.
[2] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1887-88.

Government Board,[1] and is directly exercised by the local bodies known as Guardians of the Poor. The Local Government Board provides for the central inspection of paupers; it approves or disapproves the local nominations of pauper officers; it sanctions or condemns the construction of buildings, arbitrates in disputed cases, and makes such recommendations and suggestions as it thinks fit. But there are strict limits of its powers. It cannot, for instance, command the adoption of a certain method of education, even if convinced that such a method is the best known for pauper children. The duties of the Local Government Board are, to sum up, those of supervision rather than of direct action; but it can frequently block action by withholding consent to the proposals of guardians.

Broadly speaking, the Board of Guardians is the arbiter of the destiny of pauper children. But guardians have numerous and arduous duties besides that of caring for the children. They have to provide for the multifarious wants of the sick, the aged, the unfortunate, the idle—for all, in short, to whom poor law aid must be extended; and it is also their duty to administer the ratepayers' money with scrupulous honesty and economy. The post of guardian is, therefore, one of peculiar responsibility, needing, if not special gifts, at least careful training, sound judgment, and intimate knowledge of the lives and habits of that specially perplexing section of the community, paupers of all ages and kinds. The guardian of the poor must further be willing to face heavy and tedious work, sometimes involving very nauseous details; and he must be content that his labours shall be unrequited. To be a guardian does not, as in the case of members of Parliament, confer social distinction and social privileges; nor is election an acknowledgment of business success and capacity, such as is implied by appointment to the higher municipal offices. Indeed, if we may judge from the guardian of fiction, and the general reproach addressed to Bumbledom, the position, though with noble exceptions, has been too often filled by men quite unconscious of its serious responsi-

[1] 34 and 35 Vict. c. 70.

bilities and great opportunities, and it is cause for congratulation that in recent years there has been a perceptible awakening of public conscience in this matter. People are realising more and more vividly that the question how to treat the poor is one of the most momentous of our age, and that it cannot be answered off-hand by mere almsgiving, public or private. In the present stir of philanthrophic zeal, which, if wisely directed, may prove one of our greatest safeguards, there is no better way of serving the community, and at the same time acquiring knowledge of the suffering and needs of the poor, and the best means of helping them, than by the patient and intelligent discharge of the duties of a guardian; and the more enlightened men and women come forward to perform them the better for the nation.

But in this, as in other offices, the guardian is not a free agent, with full power to carry out any scheme of improvement which may lie near his heart; he is hampered by inherited traditions, and by that dead weight of mechanical routine which consumes the vital energy of so many of our public institutions. The two great powers of the pauper world act, indeed, to some extent, as hindrances to each other. The guardian is restricted by the regulations of the Local Government Board, even though he may believe them to be worse than useless in the exceptional cases with which he often has to deal. The Local Government Board, on the other hand, frequently lacks authority to prohibit what its wide experience leads it to condemn, and it hesitates to interfere with local customs and self-government.

Considering then the special difficulties which beset improvement in the education of our pauper children, there is, on the whole, reason for thankfulness that much that is praiseworthy has been achieved. Yet if we look at what still remains to do, we shall see that this is no time to rest on our oars; that, on the contrary, there is all the more need for strenuous effort, that the good work may be carried on to its completion. And that this may come to pass, it is essential that the principles which ought to guide us should be fully discussed and considered, in order that they

may be clearly understood and supported by the general public.

How the pauper child was, too often, treated under the old *régime*, how he was farmed out to a contractor on lowest terms, and then apprenticed to some small householder or tradesman, is graphically described, we fear, with little exaggeration in *Oliver Twist*. *His* guardians were evidently of the opinion of Miss Kilmansegg's, 'that people with naught were naughty,' and should be treated accordingly. At length, however, the scandal of these abuses and a change in public feeling led to new methods of rearing pauper children. These vary according to the custom and opinion of the different Boards of Guardians on whom, by good or bad fortune, the fate of the children depends. They are as follows:—

(1) Bringing them up exclusively in the workhouse, schooling being supplied within its walls.

(2) Bringing them up in the workhouse, but sending them out to elementary schools,—a plan chiefly employed in country unions, where the number of children is few, but also practised with success in some of our largest towns.

(3) Separate and district schools. These are strictly pauper institutions, theoretically forming part of the workhouse, although sometimes many miles distant; but the service, which in the workhouse is performed by adult paupers, is in the schools done by paid servants, with more or less help from the children, whom they are directed to train in domestic work. The schools are usually in the country, and it is intended that all communication between the children and adult pauperism should be severed. When, however, the separate school stands, as sometimes happens, within the workhouse enclosure, such severance is in name, not in fact.

There is no distinction of principle between the separate and district school, the only difference being that the former receives the children of one union or parish only; the latter of several, and is therefore generally by far the larger institution, numbering in one instance over 1,800 children. Children from distant unions can be received as boarders

in these schools if there should happen to be vacancies. In both separate and district schools the elder pupils are half-timers, a portion of their day being given to industrial training. The *Exmouth* training ship is a district school.

(4) Cottage homes. These, when under the management of guardians, are, however, simply separate or district schools on the group instead of the block system.

(5) Certified homes. Here the children have been transferred by the guardians from their control to that of the voluntary managers with whom they have entered into agreement, but they retain power to withdraw the children if they see fit. Connection with the workhouse and with pauper officers is entirely severed by this plan, and the children are separated into small groups, though juvenile pauper still associates with juvenile pauper. Guardians are also empowered to send children to uncertified homes upon certain conditions (43-44 Vict. c. 54, sec. 10), but there are difficulties of payment which discourage their use; and the Local Government Board, whose consent must be obtained, sometimes makes objection to this method.

(6) Emigration. There was formerly, we believe, no bar to the employment of this outlet, and the plan was for some years freely pursued, Canada being chosen as within easy reach and also in pressing need of labour. After a time the Local Government Board was informed that abuses had arisen, and prohibited the emigration of pauper children. The cause for this interruption having been removed, it permitted tentatively a resumption of emigration in 1883, with strict rules to secure adequate inspection; but these rules were not duly complied with, and the permission of the Department had to be again withdrawn.

The obstacle was, however, at length overcome by the co-operation of the Canadian Government, which undertook to organise adequate inspection in the Dominion. Emigration was again, in 1886, sanctioned by the Local Government Board, under certain conditions, but with a strong recommendation against emigrating girls above twelve years of age.

(7) Boarding-out with foster-parents, the guardians of

the union to which the child belongs paying the cost of its maintenance, schooling, and other expenses. The application of this method is limited to the practically parentless.

Of these schemes that of the large schools and of boarding-out have been in different parts of the kingdom respectively the most important and largely employed, and it is interesting to trace how they have alternated one with the other, especially in London. First we find the children placed in homes, but not safeguarded; abuses are discovered, and they are in consequence massed together in some big institution where even worse evils ensue, the mortality among the infants occasionally reaching cent per cent, and in desperation they are dispersed again. The history of the Gray Coat School in Westminster is to some extent an illustration. Towards the end of the seventeenth century 'the parish authorities boarded out the destitute children of the city with uneducated and often disreputable women, to whom they gave the title of nurses. There were no day schools for the children to attend; the money allowed for them never exceeded eighteenpence a week, and the nurses availed themselves of these opportunities and trained the children to be professional beggars.'[1] As a prevention of the like miseries, and to save the children thus 'brought to shamefull, untimely death and destruction,' the 'Royal Foundation of Queen Anne,' namely, a free school for forty children, was erected. The scholars boarded in the schoolhouse, and industrial training must have been given, as there is mention in the old minute-books of spinning being taught to the boys. Some of these minutes are curious and suggestive; one speaks of the hair of a girl,

[1] *An Old Westminster Endowment*, by Elsie Day: C. F. Hodgson & Son, 1885. 'The governing body,' says Miss Day, 'had a wise general view of a teacher's office and work. They end their statement [for the management of the School] thus:—"The master shall study and endeavour to win the love and affection of the children, thereby to invite and encourage them rather than by correction to force them to learne, reason as well as experience having plainly shewne that too great severity does rather dull than sharpen the wit and memory; and such education, being slavish, is the principall cause why many children rejoice at all opportunities to neglect their learning, which they find to their grief and vexation when they come to years of discretion."'

rejoicing in the extraordinary name of Parrage Cross, being sold for nearly £4, which was to be kept for her, with 5 per cent interest, 'until such time as she should go out into the world.' This hair-cutting was doubtless a precaution against dirt and vermine (*sic*), to which allusion is made in the minutes, and which are the constant torment of large assemblages of boys and girls of this class. The school grew in importance and numbers, and at length the pendulum swung back again, the scholars were dispersed, and the fine old building is now an endowed school for day girls only. Scotland and Ireland furnish similar experiences.

The necessity for removing children from the unhealthy atmosphere of the workhouse has long been recognised, especially in London. An Act passed in the beginning of George the Third's reign required the duly authenticated registration of the reception, and other particulars, of all infants under four in all workhouses within the bills of mortality, *i.e.* the seventeen parishes within, and the twenty-three without the city walls, the liberty of the Tower, and the ten parishes of Westminster. The result of keeping these registers for five years, during which time the mortality reached 80, 90, and even cent per cent, was the passing of a further Act, generally known by the name of its chief promoter, Sir Jonas Hanway. It directed that, from the first of July 1769, all parish children under the age of six, in all workhouses within the bills of mortality, and all children to be received into such workhouses, if above two and under six, should be sent, within fourteen days, not less than three miles from any part of the cities of London and Westminster; while all children born in the workhouse, if not suckled by the mother, and all other workhouse children under two, were to be sent, within fourteen days, not less than five miles from their parishes. The maintenance charge was fixed at 2s. 6d. a week up till six; if the child remained in the country after that age, the weekly payment was reduced to 2s. A gratuity of 10s. was also to be given to each nurse who, having taken charge of a child under nine months old, nursed and reared it satisfactorily for a year. Supervision was to be given by five noblemen and gentlemen for each parish,

chosen under the title of Guardians of the Parish Poor Children. They were to be elected every three years; their office was to visit the children, report cases of neglect or improper conduct to the guardians, and if these did not find a remedy, then they were to apply to a Justice of the Peace.

The Act shows the solicitude felt for the children, and also that the true principle of dealing with them was recognised; but the masculine supervision of the pauper babies, instead of the womanly inspection and direction so essential to them, prepares us for disappointment. Domestic and social conditions which have made womanly supervision possible have also rendered the scheme of boarding-out in foster-homes the real benefit to the children it was intended to be by Sir Jonas Hanway, but which it failed to prove.

Advantage of this Act was taken, more recently, to send pauper children to the Contractor's establishment (as it was called) of Mr. Aubin at Norwood—one admirable of its kind. It was afterwards transferred to Hanwell, and became the district school for Central London, a curious historical growth, and one which would have greatly astonished Sir Jonas Hanway could he have witnessed it.[1]

Placing out children in foster-homes, now called boarding-out, seems to have obtained from time immemorial, and, under the form of fosterage, to have been the original and natural method of dealing with parentless children among the peoples both of the East and of the West. The testimony of myths and legends is uniform on this point. In fairy tales and stories we find constant accounts of mysterious children deserted by unknown parents, and adopted, generally by childless couples, as, for instance, Perditá and

[1] There is a provision in this same Act with reference to apprenticeship, which is worth quoting as showing that increase of population was regarded very differently in the days when George the Third was king from now, due probably to its diminution from the mortality caused by the long wars England was engaged in, and from a general ignorance of sanitary laws. It runs as follows:—'But whereas it often disturbs the peace of domestic life, *checks* marriage, and discourages industry to place out boys to the age of twenty-four years, it is enacted that boys, as well as girls, may be apprenticed for the term of seven years, and till they shall attain their respective ages of twenty-one, and no longer.' Apprenticeship till twenty-four might be revived with advantage if it would act as a check to marriage before that age.

Undine. Proofs of the high lineage of the befriended little ones turn up at the critical moment; then the kindly old foster-parents are rewarded by the munificent gratitude of their adopted child, who is always a model of valour and beauty, and all that a long undiscovered prince or princess should be.

One pretty Japanese story makes the little girl, lost at some large fair, to be adopted by the hereditary enemy of her house, ignorant of her pedigree, and taking her partly to console himself and his wife for the loss of their only son, torn from them by the cruel pressure of the crowd. Years after, the foster-father takes his daughter, now grown a sweet and pretty girl, to revisit the place where he found her. They meet there an old man and his son, and join in refreshments under the trees. The young people amuse themselves, as young people will, by falling in love; the old people amuse themselves, as old people will, by garrulous memories, making at the same time the double discovery that they have adopted each other's child, and are of hostile houses, and bound by their religion to fight. With tears and regrets they prepare to kill each other, when the girl, woman-like, finds a way out of the difficulty, marries her lover; and we trust they lived happily ever afterwards —a gentle, quaint, Japanese Romeo and Juliet without the tragedy.

Fosterage indeed, and its modern equivalent, boarding-out, though occasionally suspended for other more elaborate methods, has never been wholly given up. In its present form, where outside help is utilised and the children surrounded by safeguards, it is fully and officially approved in the United Kingdom; but England in this matter lags behind her sisters Ireland and Scotland. It has spread to our colonies, where it has received a very remarkable development. It has been the ancient usage of France, even under very complicated conditions, which have, however, varied with different governments; and it prevails more or less, according to our information, in all other nations of Europe and the United States.

Each of the different methods of treating pauper children

we have enumerated has its own advocates, though the one first mentioned—that, viz., of retaining them in the workhouse—is becoming daily more discredited, especially in large urban unions. The others, all originated by zealous and benevolent people anxious for the welfare of the children committed to their care, either officially or by the claims of humanity, find warm partisans convinced of their superiority and eager to assert their merits. To us they represent steps leading inevitably the one to the other, and have a peculiar interest as showing the wide circles through which the human mind takes its flight before settling down on a truth which, once discovered, seems so natural and obvious that the wonder is it was not seized and acted on long before.

We have spoken of the State as responsible for the children under its charge, but we must remember that the State is not a term applying to officials only. Every man and woman in the realm shares both its duties and responsibilities with reference to these little ones, since it is with its individual members the decision rests as to who shall have the control of their upbringing. Every citizen who possesses a vote in the election of guardians is, to that extent, directly responsible; while each one of us, whatever our station or means, can influence to some extent public opinion, and in this or other ways do more or less to better the condition of desolate young lives left to the care of strangers. It is with reference to the share of the general public in this arduous but interesting work that we venture to bring before them a very concise summary (to deal fully with the subject would require not one but many volumes) of the various forms of education, and their results, given in different parts of the Empire to this large family from whose ranks we recruit either the class of workers and labourers, humble but valuable citizens, or the unprofitable and wasteful inmates of our workhouses and gaols, very much according to the way in which we treat their childhood.

CHAPTER II

THE WORKHOUSE AS HOME AND SCHOOL

'It was a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance; and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement, in them, of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man.'—EDMUND BURKE.

'Then I knew,
At my own cost, what each man cometh to
When every pleasure from his life is gone,
And hunger and desire of life alone,
That still beget dull age and bestial fears,
Like gnawing serpents, through the world he bears.'
W. MORRIS.

IN the words we have quoted above from Burke, he refers to the penal system then existing in Ireland; but they may unhappily be applied with at least equal truth to the administration of the poor law in this country, such as it yet is (notwithstanding the vast improvements of the past fifty years) in places where a long period of indifference or ignorance in its administrators, combined with the drifting together of many hundreds of paupers under one roof, have made classification and individual treatment alike impossible.

There is perhaps no more gloomy building to be found than the old-fashioned workhouse such as still exists in many of our large towns, except maybe the prison. The two buildings indeed resemble each other in many ways; there is the same dreary absence of all that makes life joyous and interesting; the same long, blank walls, broken only by a few small windows; the same endless passages, always smelling of damp whitewash.

Both bear the stamp of a certain enforced and unnatural restraint; both have a dull and spiritless population, wearing regulation uniforms of unbroken monotony. In one respect, indeed, and a vital one, the prison of our day has the advantage. There hope is not banished; good conduct, industry, and obedience under punishment, may shorten the term of sentence, and prove a key to unfasten the doors of the stronghold. It is over the *workhouse* gate that Dante's dread warning might be inscribed. Sir George Nicholls indeed pointed out that a poor law is necessary, not for the relief of destitution only, but for effecting improvement in the character, habits, and social condition of the people; but we fear its latter object, in regard certainly to adults, is too often lost sight of by its administrators.[1] It grants no reward to industry and self-control. For these and other reasons, less immediately perceptible, it would seem impossible to discover a place less suited than a workhouse for bringing up children to whom a healthy development of mind and body is of paramount importance. Yet for many years, especially after the formation of unions and the great increase in the size and number of our workhouses, the dominant idea adopted by the State for dealing with these poor little creatures was to immure them therein.

Condemned to live within the cheerless workhouse walls, children almost cease to be recognised as such. They are classified as 'ins and outs' and 'permanents,' and known as juvenile paupers—a name of dire significance, implying that, legally, they possess, and can possess, nothing of their own. They are, in short, brought up in a most debased form of communism, living among hundreds of people who are actually

[1] The Rev. Samuel A. Barnett has very recently enforced consideration of the dual purpose of a poor law. 'At great cost of time and thought, a few men have hardly established the principle that the poor law is a means of education. . . . In a civilised State . . . the wrong-doer is treated as one to be educated. . . . Men and women who have become poor have as much right to be educated. . . . Tonics are not a universal remedy, and some characters are too weak to endure the tonic of strict treatment. . . . It is for want of character that so many suffer, and those means [of poor relief] alone are worth support which are fellow-workers with God to develop character.'—'A Scheme for the Unemployed,' *The Nineteenth Century*, Nov. 1888.

penniless, and yet have all things needful; being fed, clothed, and sheltered without the stimulus of remunerative effort.

An integral part of the poor law is the principle which declares it to be illegal to pay wages to paupers, since, if capable of earning them, they are not, strictly speaking, destitute, and therefore not entitled to relief,—a principle depriving even the pupils of pauper schools of the invigorating influence of paid industry. The late Dr. Kay, afterwards Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, describing the admirable effect at the late Lady Byron's school at Ealing Grove of allowing boys to be paid for cultivating the land belonging to the institution, and to dispose of the produce of the small gardens allotted to each lad, adds:—'The plans pursued at Ealing Grove would require considerable modification in a school containing pauper children. *It would not be possible to afford the stimulus of wages* for land not allotted to the children, nor could the profits of the allotments be given to children maintained at the expense of the ratepayers.'[1]

Thus in performing work, rightly required of them, paupers are in fact, disguise it as we will, reduced to slavery; and the vices of the slave—indolence, lack of self-control, indifference to the value of property, and absolute dependence upon others—are painfully apparent in those who have dwelt long within workhouse walls. Why more than mere shelter and the barest sustenance should be bestowed, at the cost of the struggling ratepayer, upon the able-bodied pauper, it is hard to conceive; and why the most potent motive to exertion with which our Creator has inspired us—the necessity, namely, of satisfying our natural wants—should be annihilated by the provisions of our poor law, it is equally impossible satisfactorily to explain. That a man who is unable to supply himself with all he needs should therefore be relieved of the duty of earning any part—that the idle and insubordinate should share alike with the industrious and docile, and that to the pauper the possibility should not exist of gaining, by extra exertion, some small fund with which to start in the world afresh—

[1] *Report from the Poor-law Commissioners on the Training of Pauper Children*, 1841.

are defects working daily and hourly for evil, degrading the inmates of our workhouses to one dead level of hopeless and demoralising dependence. Yet these inmates are derived from that class which, above all others, from circumstances of birth, education, and social position, most need the application of every available spur to self-reliance. Indeed paupers under our present system may be likened to a watch with the mainspring broken—the hands may be directed as we will, but they have no motion of their own.

Can it be surprising that, brought up in establishments governed on these principles, the minds of workhouse children are often without an elementary perception of property, and all that the word implies? The very clothes they wear often change backs every time they are returned from the laundry, so that even this simplest instance of *meum* and *tuum* is unknown to them. The desire, instinctive in human beings, to acquire and possess, has to be educated and controlled like other passions; and these children, to whom no such training has been given, can scarcely be blamed for the dishonesty with which they are frequently charged when first leaving the workhouse and entering upon entirely new conditions. They often appropriate things irresistibly attractive to them, in so frank and open a manner, that it would be amusing if it were not provoking and even dangerous; for it may be noted that these childish pickings are seldom conducted on the secretive method of habitual thieves. Such a communistic disposition of property, too, not only gives an impulse to dishonesty, but it prevents the children realising the true value of money, so that when they begin to earn it they have no notion how far it should go, nor what are the prices of the commonest necessaries of life. This leads to extravagant and foolish spending of what they earn when they are emancipated from the workhouse, for as they have not been taught to calculate and think about these things, they cannot start themselves in thrifty and careful ways. We hear of them sometimes making away with articles from the outfit bestowed on them without a thought on their part, sooner than mend them, and otherwise showing a wanton disregard for saving and property.

But this depressing absence of all sense of the rights and enjoyments of free labour is far from being the only or most malign influence to which childhood in the workhouse is subjected. It cannot, unfortunately, be doubted that children in these schools are liable to ill-treatment, and that they dare not complain. 'I have reason to believe,' says the late Mr. Carleton Tufnell, inspector of pauper schools, 'great cruelties are practised at times on the children, which probably do not always come to light, as a schoolmaster has no difficulty in awing an unhappy orphan, who probably has not a friend in the world, into silence. . . . Where is a poor friendless orphan or foundling (for of these classes a great proportion of the workhouse children consist) to turn for assistance, when it knows no one on whom it can place confidence, or to whom it can utter complaints?'[1] In another report he gives the case of a boy who suffered from shameful ill-treatment, but did not venture to complain till years after, when he had been transferred to another school.

Miss Joanna Hill relates another instance, in this case of a girl, who said nothing of her sufferings while at school, but the truth of whose statements was confirmed by independent testimony. 'I asked her why she did not complain of certain acts of cruelty practised by the school-mistress (cruelty not discovered till the mistress was dismissed *nine* years afterwards). "We knew we should only have it worse when the gentlemen were gone, and so we bit our lips and bore it!" Let me add that after the acts of cruelty I mention had taken place, and before those had been committed which led to the mistress being dismissed, an extremely laudatory mention of this very school-mistress by the workhouse master, who lived under the same roof with her, was forwarded to the Poor Law Board by the school inspector; he fully endorsed it, and it appears in the annual report of that Board.'[2] The master performed his duty in daily going through the school

[1] *Report on the Training of Pauper Children*, 1841.

[2] *A Plea for the Extension of the Boarding-out System*, by Joanna M. Hill. Birmingham, 1883.

premises, and the guardians probably made their periodical visit; but the time of their coming was known, and all was fair on the surface when they passed through. One form of cruelty practised by this wicked woman was to take a child's head between her hands and knock it violently against the wall. Her miserable pupils were at length delivered from their tyrant by the discovery of bruises on their bodies caused by her kicks and blows. As poor law regulations make the schoolmistress responsible for the inspection of the children's persons, it is obvious such conduct as we have described may long escape detection, where neither victims nor their companions dare to complain.

But worse even than bodily suffering is the moral corruption to which children in the workhouse are exposed. To that dreary retreat drift the unsuccessful and incapable, those so feeble in mind and body, or so resolutely vicious, that they are unable to gain a bare subsistence, and who find here a shelter from the consequences of indolence and debauchery. These inmates contaminate the moral health of a workhouse as surely and as poisonously as small-pox or scarlet fever patients would endanger the physical health of a household. The testimony on this point is, from all sides, decisive and appalling,—from inspectors, poor law guardians, visitors and workhouse officials alike, who deplore the evils they are, at any rate individually, unable to prevent, though they frequently do their best to modify them. A suggestion by the Rev. William Adamson, vicar of Old Ford, is certainly worthy of consideration. He proposes that there should be two grades of workhouses—one for the lazy, vicious, and criminal, and the other for the honest, distressed, and industrious. Combined with opportunity for the former to earn admission to the latter class by good conduct, this scheme might perhaps save the deserving destitute from the unmerited suffering of evil association, and prove a valuable means of discipline for wrong-doers.

It is true there have been attempts of late years to improve the classification of inmates in workhouses. It is now a generally received rule that the children shall not associate with the adults except under certain regulations,

but it is almost impossible to enforce this, so that failure of the rule is common; and we are yet far from having surmounted all the evils, in the treatment of our juvenile paupers, described by the Poor Law Commissioners nearly fifty years ago,—evils fostered in some degree by the *vis inertiæ* which hampers progress in all that concerns our poor law department. 'The children in workhouses, even in those in which the classification is maintained with the greatest strictness,' the Commissioners said, 'are more or less associated with the women. Such associations, even where much vigilance exists, are, we are convinced, polluting. *A workhouse cannot, with the greatest attention to classification, be made a place in which young girls can be removed from the chances of corruption.*'[1] They recommended that all pauper servants and assistants whatever should be banished from children's establishments, *i.e.* separate or district schools (now happily in the main accomplished), 'as it is of primary importance to secure assistants of cheerful temper, and with habits of kindness to children, and, above all, free from those feelings of dependence which are the usual characteristics of paupers.'[2] Mr. Green, a union schoolmaster, said—'I have no doubt that the amount of juvenile delinquency has been greatly increased by the neglect of the training of pauper children in the poor-houses, by the grossly vicious examples to which they have been exposed within the workhouses, by their absconding on account of misconduct and bad treatment from their situations.'[3]

Mr. Carleton Tufnell stated—'I am confident, however, that architectural arrangements can never effectually secure perfect classification in a workhouse. Conversation, sometimes of the obscenest description, is carried on over walls and through windows. In going to dinner or chapel there are ready means of communication; doors are accidentally left open, and the adults are employed in carrying furniture or other articles from one part to another. *The atmosphere of a workhouse is tainted with vice; no one*

[1] *Report on the Training of Pauper Children*, 1841.
[2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*

who regards the future happiness of the children would ever wish them to be educated within its precincts.' [1]

'No regulations, however stringent, can prevent the contaminating association of the children with worthless adults' we were informed by a gentleman of long experience as a guardian. Yet in the Birmingham Union, to which he referred, the juvenile paupers were classed in the report of the Poor Law Board as being 'in a separate building.' This was, of course, before the present schools at Marston Green were built; but there are so-called 'separate buildings' elsewhere, in which the same evil influences are at work at the present day.

'In the almost conventual seclusion of the workhouse,' the late Mr. Edward Senior, with great acumen, pointed out, 'the dangers of evil consequences resulting from this association [of juvenile and adult paupers] is much increased, as both sexes of children must form their standard of persons generally from those they see around them, and these are, unfortunately, the very outcasts of society.' [2] 'Workhouses, and the whole system of their organisation, are alien to the proper treatment and training of the young,' wrote another inspector, the late Mr. Jelinger C. Symons, and what he noted thirty years ago still prevails. 'The practice, for instance, of allowing the elder girls to nurse the infants, wherever it obtains, brings a class remarkably susceptible of corruption into immediate contact with another class of all others most likely to corrupt them—I mean the inmates of the adult female wards, which are seldom free from the mothers of illegitimate children. It thus happens that one of the best facilities for the useful training of girls in workhouses is coupled with their chief liability to be corrupted; and that industrial discipline, which lies at the root of the cure of hereditary pauperism, is tainted with the germs of a still more deadly moral disease.' [3]

And if this primary source of mischief, viz. the association of pauper children with adult paupers, could be

[1] *Report on the Training of Pauper Children*, 1841. [2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Social Science Transactions*, 1858.

effectually prevented, the workhouse must still be a most unfit place for the bringing up of children, if only that any classification, except that of separating boys over seven from the girls and infants, is rarely attempted among them. Thus a child whose parents have kept it, as far as possible, from the knowledge of evil, should it have the irreparable misfortune to lose them and pass under State guardianship, may have to herd day and night with the children, perhaps, of criminals whose house is broken up because its head is in prison, and certainly with those of the idle and vicious—children whose sickly faces and look of premature age betray at once their vitiated descent.

Many years since Mr. Imeson, headmaster of Hanwell School, designated them 'the dregs of the population.' 'They arrive here,' he said, 'in various stages of squalor and disease; all of them are more or less debased; their intellectual capabilities are of the lowest order; their moral sense is stifled or inactive through suspicion and obstinacy. Many of them inherit the hoarse indistinct utterance of the London costermonger. Whatever point is gained by our exertions, yet we have in these children to deplore the great want of aspiring sympathies. Their natural bias is to run the course of their fathers in ignorance, and it may be in crime. With a strangely marked precocity, they are ignorant to a degree that can scarcely be overrated.'[1]

To force the orphans of maybe respectable parentage into such companionship is indeed to brand poverty as a deadly crime, and such a prospect for a loved and innocent child adds a deeper anguish to many a death-bed. In cases we have personally known, one widow was greatly comforted in her last long illness by hearing that the children for whom she had worked so bravely would be saved from workhouse life; another would repeat the words, with her eyes full of the most touching anxiety, 'Oh! if only my girl had not to come to the house.' In such companionship as we have described, children without any specially inherited vicious tendencies too often become

[1] Quoted by Mr. Collins in a letter to the *Times* of Wednesday, June 8, 1870.

vicious, while the bad tendencies of those of evil pedigree are permanently strengthened and propagate in congenial soil.

It is painful to set aside our ideal of a childhood of innocence and bright playfulness, and to realise that there are among us thousands of children familiar with shocking vice, to whose tiny mouths disgusting words and even blasphemy come naturally, and who, seemingly incapable of shame, pride themselves on their knowledge of evil. But it is still more appalling to think that this is, in numberless cases, the result of associations which might have been avoided; and we can only fervently hope that the recognition, long delayed, but sure some day to burst upon us, of the terrible wrong we are doing, may result in its complete removal. We dare not add *speedy* removal, for in these matters the State is not an eagerly anxious parent, and it takes many and incessantly repeated appeals before any perceptible effect is produced on the public conscience.

We have dwelt at this length on the evil companionship to which the children of the State are subject, because companionship and example are the most important factors in a child's education. With reference to their mental training, it is yet an open question whether it is desirable they should attain to more than reading, writing, and simplest summing, and the knowledge of common things which an intelligent teacher can impart while pursuing the humblest curriculum, though there is a growing tendency to assimilate the standard of workhouse schools to that of outside elementary schools. There is little now in the workhouse school to attract energetic and ambitious teachers; the standard of requirement is lowered for them, and their pupils are most trying, not only from the natural want of inherited teachableness in many, but also on account of the peculiar conditions under which the work must be carried on. The permanent children, whom there is no reason to suppose are at first below average intelligence, gradually get their minds stunted and their capabilities stifled from the dull routine to which they are subjected, and also from the want of outside impulse and

encouragements to application; while the 'ins and outs' who enter (or rather pass through) the school for periods varying from a day to a few months, stay so short a time that the teacher beginning to be interested in his pupil has the pain of seeing him suddenly withdrawn and his labour apparently lost. Under these circumstances it is not surprising to find the mental acquirement of pauper children below the average.

Nor are the results of the industrial training more satisfactory, though in large workhouse schools provision is usually made for the boys in workshops under trade instructors. Nevertheless they rarely attain any special skill, and not often even general handiness; and frequently, lads who have spent their time in learning a trade take up another occupation on leaving the school, while the general complaint of employers is of their dulness and want of resource. According to the experience of the Leeds Guardians, which led them to close their schools and adopt boarding-out, 'the failures were numerous, and the numbers of boys continually returned upon the hands of guardians as shiftless, dull, and impracticable, was a source of constant embarrassment to the board.'[1]

The case of girls is more deplorable than that of boys. They have less variety of occupation, the only career contemplated for them being that of domestic service. This is not unreasonable, considering the great demand for skilled, or even unskilled, servants. But their chance of learning anything of the arrangements of a well-ordered household in a workhouse school is small indeed, where the wants of a large number have to be provided for, and consequently mechanical adjustments and every possible appliance are made use of to save time and labour. The consequence is that when the girls do help in the work, they get accustomed to a set routine, which creates no emergencies and demands no thought; moreover, they see food cooked in quantities which give them no sense of proportion.

Potatoes, for instance, would be an important item in

[1] *Social Science Association: Sessional Proceedings*, vol. xvi. 1882-83. Speech by Mr. Humble.

the work of a little servant, what with the cooking them and cleaning the saucepans afterwards. But in a large workhouse the only way in which she would see them cooked would be by the hundredweight in a copper, and saucepans would be almost unknown to her. Neither would she understand grate or candlestick cleaning if dwelling in a workhouse artificially heated and lighted by gas; even the washing is mainly done by washing-machines. All she would probably know would be floor scrubbing. Thus untaught and useless, the workhouse girl becomes a hindrance instead of help to a hard-worked and exasperated mistress, who has no time to remedy the defects of the previous want of training. The intricacies of such arts as cooking, needlework, bread-making, etc., are not instinctively perceived, and they cannot be thoroughly learnt in the pauper schools; but they are not beyond the powers of an intelligent girl who has been carefully trained, and who, possessing them, would always command a livelihood. And as the State does not expect to burden herself permanently with the maintenance of these children, as she herself has fixed their majority at sixteen to free herself from responsibility and expense, it is but fair to demand that she shall give them such a mental and industrial training as shall enable them to start in life at least on the same level as the children of respectable citizens.

But the industrial training given in workhouses is thus officially reported on:—'Though praiseworthy efforts are made in the larger unions to develop this side of education, there is a certain absence of system in many cases which renders the instruction desultory, and therefore almost worthless. The haphazard and irregular way in which, in small unions, the so-called industrial training is conducted, imparts a degree of slovenliness to their work which operates very prejudicially when the children are first sent out to service.'[1] The following extract from a letter from the master of the Shepton Mallet Union illustrates our meaning:—'You will be pleased to learn that we have started a separate cooking kitchen for the purpose of teaching the older girls. It is

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1880-81.

quite apart from the adults, and the matron takes the superintendence of it. We have two girls in each day; they come in early, clean the kitchen, light the fire, and prepare our own breakfast; wash up, prepare vegetables for dinner, and take part in cooking the same. Our reason for starting this is, that when the girls *go out to service they are frequently called stupid because they are unacquainted with the names and uses of kitchen articles, whereas it is simply ignorance from not having seen or used them.*'[1] The italics are in the original.

It is thus obvious that the industrial training in the workhouse must be open to the fatal objection of communication with and contamination from the adults. This has already been pointed out with regard to girls, who might be trained as nursemaids in tending the babies, but that the evil of such communication is intensified by the presence of the numerous unmarried mothers.[2]

Poor law regulations require that pauper children capable of instruction shall receive it for three hours daily in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and the principles of the Christian religion; and that such other instruction shall be given to them as may fit them for service and train them to habits of usefulness, industry, and virtue.[3] If a Board of Guardians fail to provide necessary teachers and apparatus, they may be compelled to do so by a Mandamus. By the Elementary Education Act of 1876, which directs that proceedings shall be taken against a parent who neglects to provide efficient elementary instruction for his child of school age, guardians have become similarly responsible

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1880-81.

[2] The following painful statistics are from the *Eleventh Annual Report of the Local Government Board*, 1881-82. In the metropolis three-fourths of the women confined in the workhouse infirmaries are unmarried, the numbers given being 4767 married, 16,277 unmarried. In the country unions matters are as bad or even worse. South Midland District, 490 married, 3144 unmarried; South-Western, 470 married, 5841 unmarried. Most of these women are not permanent inmates, going in only for confinement; but the female children are certain to come more or less in contact with them.

[3] See valuable remarks on this requirement by Mr. Holgate, *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1887-88.

to School Board authority, as they are *in loco parentis* to the children under their care. We have never heard of this authority being so applied, but we think it should be exercised, due regard being of course had to the circumstances of the case. It is only within the last few years that children detained in Metropolitan workhouses have been sent to outside elementary schools, as at Lambeth and St. Pancras, and we believe in some other few instances. Yet such children are liable to be so detained for many months from one cause or another; and as a school within the workhouse premises (unless under distinct management and certified by the Local Government Board) must be paid for out of local rates, guardians do not care to incur the cost, and these children go without elementary teaching unless sent to a school outside. Thus in the case of each child left without instruction, the Elementary Education Act is violated; and this remark applies equally to the children in provincial workhouses wherever, being capable of receiving instruction, they are not attending school.

The mental training given in workhouse schools is apt to be below the outside standard, owing partly to surrounding circumstances, but also to the inferiority of the teaching staff and apparatus, though there are of course exceptions to the latter rule, especially if the school be large. In these cases, however, the one merit sometimes claimed for the workhouse school, namely, that of small numbers admitting of individual knowledge and treatment, is lost. We must add that the children brought up in the rough and ready ways of a small country workhouse are said to have a fair chance of becoming helpful and self-supporting, and this method is advocated by experienced persons (notably by Mr. T. Ll. Murray Browne), who strongly condemn the large and elaborately arranged separate school; but here again the question of companionship crops up, as often the lowest class of tramps make a short stay in these country workhouses, when their children are placed with the others, and there is the certainty of more or less association with the adults besides. It is, indeed, not unusual, where the children are few, to put them under the care of grown-

up paupers, and even to employ these as industrial trainers. They cannot be employed as school teachers, because that is a paid office.

With reference to the mere feeding of the children, the State makes sufficient provision—at least if we may judge by the diet table of a large Metropolitan workhouse now before us, and supposing that children needed no variety. The quality of the food will always depend on the degree to which guardians and officers do their duty in securing good material, and cooking and serving it well; the quantity allowed is generally ample, though perhaps not always judicious, as one pound of meat-pie for every inmate over two years of age seems a large order for small stomachs.

The great defect of these diet tables, and it is a most serious one, is the lack of variety both as to quantity and selection. The choice of materials is very limited, even the puddings showing a dreary monotony of rice and suet, suet and rice; and exactly the same food, in exactly the same quantities, is served on exactly the same days, so that appetite and enjoyment are never heightened by a surprise. The same quantity of food is provided for the child who can eat but little and the child who can eat largely. The result is insufficient nourishment for the large eaters, sometimes remedied by bullying the little ones into giving up food they really want, and frightful waste in regard to children with small appetites. We have seen a look of despair, almost of loathing, in the face of a delicate child on a plate loaded with not tempting fare being put down before it, and many such scarcely touched when the meal was over—the valuable lesson thus being lost, that to send away uneaten food on a plate is extravagant and wrong. One feels as though these children should be little automata instead of human beings, to obey all these clockwork arrangements. Certainly their digestions, unless preternaturally strong, must be severely tried.

The need for more varied food was pointed out fourteen years ago by Mrs. Nassau Senior, and has been touched upon by other inspectors, but very little has yet been done to supply it. In some schools, however, more variety

prevails than in others; a little change is given by using fruit from the garden occasionally for the children, as well as for the officers, and sometimes they are allowed to go blackberrying, and to have the fruit they have gathered served in puddings.

The fixed quantity has also here and there been abolished with excellent effect. At Nottingham, where in other respects, too, the guardians have shown a spirit of reform, they have, says Mr. J.[1]R. Mozley, Inspector of Poor Law Schools, issued regulations concerning the children's food, which leave within certain limits the amount given to each to the discretion of the superintendent and matron, and afford some opportunity for variety. 'The result,' he adds, 'seemed to have justified the plan: on my recent visit (January 6, 1887) there had not been a child on the medical officer's list since last April. The number of children in this institution has of late averaged 150 or so.'[1]

As for the clothing, we know of instances in which the singularly ugly and disfiguring uniform, too often adopted, has brought real misery to the wearers, besides being hated as a badge of pauperism. If it were intended to produce indifference to appearances and contempt for dress in its wearers, it fails signally in its intended effect. The love of adornment is too innate, too much of a natural impulse, at any rate with women, to be repressed by any method yet discovered; consequently we hear of young women, set to pick oakum, secreting portions of it to make themselves fashionable tournures, and the poke bonnet, formerly provided in a girl's outfit for service, being speedily cut up and made to resemble as nearly as possible the more fashionable hat. Curious evidence of how far fit and comfort are considered, where most essential to a growing child, may be found in the fact that 'hobnailed boots with iron tips' are supplied by contract for the infants in one of our large pauper schools.[2] No wonder these unlucky children have a heavy walk peculiarly their own. Years ago a lady, to whom pauper children owe a deep debt of

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1886-87.
[2] *Metropolitan*, May 19, 1888.

gratitude, pointed out the suffering inflicted by 'pinching shoes, where there is no mother to listen to the complaint and find a remedy.'[1]

The frock of the pauper girl is usually of stout woollen material, good for winter, but generally worn all the year round, and must, in the case of the hard-worked elder girls, become, as an inspector has remarked, 'saturated with perspiration.' Washing stuffs would be much healthier in summer, but the additional burden on the laundry is generally dreaded. It would appear, however, not sufficiently so to save the girls of a metropolitan school from wearing thin cotton frocks, affording no protection from cold, in winter as well as summer—an evil not discovered until a lady was elected to the Board of Guardians concerned. Of whatever material made, the frocks are too often clumsily cut and ill-sewed, setting a bad example of untidiness before the children; and the long skirts in which the little girls are apt to be attired (to allow for growth we presume) impede their movements, adding to their awkward gait. Here and there a kind-hearted and not too busy matron adopts a better pattern, and sees that the frocks are turned out neatly from the workroom, so that they shall not afford the accustomed ugly badge of pauperism.

The boys' uniform is not, as a rule, so disfiguring as that of the girls; but for clothing that passes from one wearer to another (as is the case necessarily with ins and outs), material that can be washed should be more largely employed, especially for little children. The suits worn at the Roman Catholic school, under the management of ladies, at Mill Hill, which receives little boys from workhouses, are well adapted to their purpose. Hats, caps, and bonnets should especially be washable, or so cheap as to be renewed for every comer; but we have never heard that such is the case. It can hardly be doubted that much head and skin disease is communicated by the heritage of clothes.

[1] *A Scheme for Befriending Orphan Pauper Girls*, by Hannah Archer, Longmans, 1867. This pamphlet advocates Boarding-out, which will be dealt with in a later chapter.

The bodily cleanliness of the children is enforced by a thorough purifying when they first enter the workhouse—in some cases a difficult and nauseous process. Those unacquainted with our lowest classes might suppose that the luxury of personal cleanliness, at least, would be highly appreciated by these neglected creatures. But as a rule the ins and outs make little or no effort to maintain for themselves the advantages they have received. If in their numerous discharges they leave the workhouse thoroughly cleansed, they return in a short time as dirty as ever. One of them, to the not unnatural remonstrance of the officer, on having to perform her disagreeable task again so quickly, answered, 'It is your duty to clean heads, and only what you are paid for,'—a very characteristic expression of pauper sentiment.

The sanitary arrangements of the older workhouses leave indeed much to be desired, but they are well inspected, and usually kept as sweet as circumstances permit. In the more modern buildings the advanced improvements of sanitary skill are carefully studied and applied, though necessarily at enormous cost; and on the whole, taking into consideration the numbers of more or less sickly persons massed together, these institutions have been fairly free from outbreaks of fever and diseases of that type; but where the numbers are large the children suffer from ophthalmia, a most disabling malady, which seems to flourish with terrible persistence in this congenial soil, so that the red, sore eyes of a workhouse child are almost characteristic. In spite, too, of scientific regulations, there are unmistakable symptoms of depressed vitality, marking low health. That pauper children show so little sign of those animal spirits which are the outcome of bodily health and vigour, even though they are sufficiently fed and sheltered, is no doubt due to the dreary monotony of their lives; in regard to the permanent children, it is a childhood without holidays or change until they are suddenly cast out upon the world. In one of Mr. Carleton Tufnell's reports, the case of a girl is incidentally referred to, who, placed in the workhouse in infancy and dying there at fifteen, 'never knew what

it was to go out for a holiday.'[1] This was an exceptional case, we must trust, as Christmas treats, and in summer a day in the open country, though far from universal, are not now uncommon. But that seclusion still prevails the following incident, which occurred only a few months ago, serves to show. A lady asked two little girls of nine and thirteen for a day's visit at Christmas, from the neighbouring country workhouse. They had been there five years, nobody had ever gone to see them, and they had never been out. Their great pleasure was to see their dinner cooked; apparently they had never been in a kitchen or seen a joint before the fire. They are described as seeming utterly mazed and stupid at first, but they brightened up before they left, and the eldest confided to the cook that 'she did so long to go to service and wanted to mind babies.' The workhouse is a well-looked-after, kindly-managed place, but the accustomed routine had evidently not been broken in their case.

Of course in an unwieldy establishment, where the majority of the inmates are insubordinate and rebellious, strict rules are necessary; but they are applied too stringently to those who do not need repressive treatment, and who suffer physically and morally from mechanical routine and the suppression of all individuality. It must be acknowledged, moreover, that there still exists, even in some well managed workhouses, an opposition to outside intervention, although its object be to brighten the dull lives of its afflicted inmates. Want of tact and judgment here and there among workhouse visitors may partly excuse it, but it is also evidence that some of that jealousy of voluntary help yet remains which was encountered by Miss Louisa Twining, to whom more gratitude is due than to any other one person for the improvement in workhouse management of the past thirty years. When she craved permission for herself and a few of her friends to enter some of the metropolitan workhouses, it was, when not refused, granted with difficulty and as a favour; and doubtless to them it was a true favour, as it enabled them to bring light into dark places, and to cheer the sick and suffering.

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1873-74.

Accompanying a worker in a different field, Miss Octavia Hill, in her first visit to a workhouse, we asked her how her mind was affected by the establishment—a very large and, so far as was apparent, a well-ordered one, revealing in every part the presence of strict discipline. Intimately acquainted with the poor in the freedom of their own homes, she answered, the one overwhelming impression was that of *power*. She had been taught by experience, more precious than gold, for it had been bought by human suffering, that there is mortal danger in freeing our fellow-creature from a single duty laid upon him by his Creator, and that the philanthropist may rarely attempt more than to clear impediments from before the stumbling feet, or to invigorate the weary back to bear its own burden. Answering us, she avowed herself awestruck by the vastness of the responsibility incurred in the wholesale assumption of the claims of parent, child, and citizen, and the correlative assumption of unlimited authority over those yielding up those claims which the administration of our poor law involves—an authority which saps the very foundation of individual self-government. This repressive authority, by reducing every one to the same dead level, must stifle or pervert the natural impulses to right activity. To its influence in regard to women and girls, and the herding them together in large numbers, are doubtless in great measure due those outbreaks of noisiest insubordination and wild passion to which under such conditions they are proverbially liable. 'You see, sir, they are the girls who have been brought up in the house,' was the apologetic explanation by a workhouse master, after one of those scenes, the horrors of which can only be realised by those who have witnessed these poor creatures, seemingly under demoniac possession.

We are indebted for the following narrative, written at the time the scenes occurred, to Mrs. Shaen, now guardian for Kensington, who formerly was visitor of the ward for able-bodied women in the workhouse of another union where the events she relates took place :—

'There have been sad outbreaks since my previous visit. I saw in the *Times* that some of my poor girls had

got fourteen days' imprisonment. One of my best had misbehaved while a missionary was reading, and had been ordered off to the refractory ward, and about forty women rose to the rescue, hustled the officers, and barricaded the ward. The police were called in, and they had to break the door open and carry off four of the girls to jail. I am quite sure force ought not to be tried towards women. It is worse than useless. These women are more than a match for a brigade of police. I am told the rough usage of the girls was sad to see. Of course I heard the whole story, and had to quiet and pacify some who were still burning with resentment. The magistrate who committed them said it was a shame such sturdy women should be a burden to the ratepayers; but he does not know there is no work, no honest sphere of living, for girls like these. They have tried, and I have tried for them, and one is an epitome of all. Nobody will take a workhouse girl, for they are ignorant and incapable, and too often bad, almost from necessity. . . . It is a fact that statesmen will have to recognise, that we are bringing up thousands for whom there is no career but vice. There is absolutely no place in society for the workhouse girl.'

The circumstances related happened some years back, and we have reason to hope that no such battle-royal could occur now; but cases of individual violence among female inmates, authorising, if not necessitating, strong-handed suppression by male officers or police, still bring disgrace upon our poor law system.

In speaking thus of workhouse inmates, it is right to state our conviction that, though a large proportion are morally degraded on their entrance, and become more so the longer they stay, yet there are always to be found some who are well disposed, and, particularly among the sick, individual examples of piety, cheerful submission to their dreary lot, and a purity of mind that would adorn any rank of life.

Nor can we doubt that the majority of the officers discharge their duties conscientiously, and with greatly needed patience, denying themselves necessary holidays lest their absence should cause mischief; or that guardians as a body

desire to do their best for the paupers, consistently with their obligations towards the ratepayers, and that they feel, as regards the children specially, a warm and sincere interest in their welfare. That the results attained are so unsatisfactory we attribute, first, to the inherent difficulties presented by the very nature of the evil—pauperism—to be dealt with; secondly, to some defects in the poor law, which we shall afterwards deal with; thirdly, to its chief administration falling wholly, until very lately, and still almost entirely into the hands of one sex, while it needs the combined experience and intelligence of both; and lastly, perhaps chiefly, to the entire absence from pauper government of the vital principle of individualisation. 'The whole system,' remarks a relieving officer, 'as regards the class of whom we are now more especially speaking [namely, girls and the women into whom they develop], is so rotten, so opposed to common sense, decency, and right feeling, and so irrational, that one is at a loss how to designate it. The whole of this class would at least appear to be placed from beginning to end in the *wrong hands*. Neither guardians, relieving officers, nor taskmasters should have anything to do with them, but they should be placed under the sole management of a discreet but firm matron, aided, if necessary, by the master. A system of conciliation and encouragement should be pursued towards them. Rewards for good conduct in the house and for continuing in service should be held out to them; this, with allowing the free visitation of ladies, would not fail of going a great way towards reclaiming them. The system at present practised towards them exasperates them, and causes most of them to pursue a life of vice for which it will not be held guiltless.'[1]

Young women who grow up in a workhouse (now happily far fewer than when this book first appeared) still form a class proverbial for audacity and shamelessness. The chaplain rarely visits them, conscious that they are

[1] *Journal of the Workhouse Visiting Society*, February 1860. It may be objected that an opinion uttered nearly thirty years ago is out of date; but an article by Mrs. S. A. Barnett in *Macmillan's Magazine* for 1879, and much more recent testimony from the pen of Miss Louisa Twining, show how true the relieving officer's words are still.

beyond his influence; and yet there are many instances in which the most obdurate have yielded to the appeals and judicious sympathy of benevolent women. Punishment only renders them more defiant, and the longest period of the cell, with bread and water diet, which the law can inflict produces little effect upon these unhappy creatures. In the workhouse are to be found a number 'of idle, ignorant, often refractory girls, brought up at the expense of the rates, or utterly spoiled by a sojourn in the adult wards, whom it is next to impossible to provide for in any way. Even when they begin with a good intention to do something for themselves, it is fatal to their progress to remember, in every vexation, temptation, and difficulty, that there is such a refuge for idleness, perverseness, and vice as the institution which was their *home* and training school. Valuable returns, furnished by guardians of two different unions, show the little chance there is for girls thus brought up. In one case of 165 girls apprenticed out in the course of three years, 73 were re-admitted to the workhouse, 13 absconded or left their employers; of 61 there was no account; 18 were reported as going on well. In the other case, 160 young women were at one time provided with clothes to enable them to get employment; of these 58, or about one-third, found their way back to the workhouse after an average time spent in service of two months and a half! They were all *habituées* of the workhouse, one with another residents of eight, of thirteen, of sixteen years, and none less than three years.'[1]

Among the remedies proposed by the authors of the paper we quote, whose practical acquaintance with the unhappy class they describe was only equalled by their benevolent efforts for their improvement, are the placing out deserted and orphan children to board in respectable families, and the introduction into workhouses of a high order of female superintendence. These recommendations, made twenty-seven years ago, and Miss Twining's of even earlier date, are but beginning to be generally acted upon!

[1] 'The Irish Poor in Workhouses,' by Ellen Woodlock and Sarah Atkinson, *Social Science Transactions*, 1861.

Rejected on all sides, troublesome and uninteresting, and too often vicious, the regular workhouse girl returns finally to the workhouse, which is the only home she has ever known. Brought up in its seclusion, she has no friends, probably few relations, and these of a doubtful kind, outside its precincts, and her only aspiration is to escape for a time from its grim routine 'for a spree,' claiming its shelter again when absolutely obliged. It is one of the many blots on the bringing up of children in the workhouse that they come to look upon it as their only and natural residence. A boy of considerable intelligence and good conduct, who was for nearly seven years in a metropolitan workhouse, says that while there 'such a thing as getting my own living and being for ever independent of the workhouse never struck me.' All he desired then was to be grown up, and 'on the men's side, where he could do as he liked.'[1]

After one discharge the girl no longer returns to the school a submissive but sullen pupil, for, once emancipated by an attempt, even unsuccessful, to gain her own living, she passes into the category of adults, and goes into their ward. 'The girls,' says Miss Twining, 'are perfectly well acquainted with their "rights" as to maintenance by their parishes and reception into the workhouses. Above the age of sixteen they are completely their own mistresses [paupers "in their own right"], and can go in or take their discharge whenever or for whatever cause they choose.' 'Many girls,' says the guardian of a large union, 'discharge themselves in the afternoon for the purpose of prostitution and return late to the house.' Another guardian, when asked why outrageous girls were not subjected to severe discipline, answered, 'We dare not; if we used coercion they would take their discharge and do worse.'

In reference to the contamination of children in the workhouse, it may be urged that the law requires them to be kept separate from this miserable class. But we have shown the impossibility of a complete separation when they

[1] *Boarding-out and Pauper Schools*, by Menella B. Smedley. Henry G. King & Co., 1875. Quoted from Mr. Carleton Tufnell.

dwell under the same roof, or even within the same enclosure; while the respectable young girl who, through no fault of her own, loses her first place, no longer ranks as a child, and at a most critical age runs an increased risk of contamination.

That 80 per cent of the girls sent to service from workhouses were failures was the opinion of the late Hon. Mrs. Way, founded on observations and inquiries pursued in every part of England for many years, and stated in her evidence before the Poor Relief Committee of 1861; and workhouse matrons and teachers of that period only too emphatically confirmed her belief.[1] And yet they might, in many cases, believe girls to be doing well who had in fact passed out of their knowledge. Some years after the date of Mrs. Way's inquiries, a lady in one of our large towns, desiring to befriend workhouse girls in service, obtained from the authorities what they believed to be the addresses of a large number who had recently been sent to situations. But on applying at the forty-five places indicated, she found fourteen only of the girls. Of the rest, some had removed with their employers to a distance, some had been dismissed for ill-behaviour, some had run away, of some she could not ascertain what fate had befallen them. Yet, though less than a third were discoverable, all would doubtless have been returned in good faith by the parish officials, if called upon for a report, as conducting themselves well.

'The case of the girls' [in workhouses], wrote Miss Cobbe, whose remarks were founded on personal observation, 'is far worse than of the boys, as all the conditions of workhouse management fall with peculiar evil on their natures. To mass boys together in large numbers, with no home influence or habits, and no attempt to draw out their affections, is dangerous; to do the same to girls is

[1] Several years later an inquiry as to the position of the boys and girls placed out from Bath Workhouse during the previous six years, showed that 43 per cent were lost sight of, about 27 per cent were ascertained to be doing well, while the conduct of all the rest was more or less unsatisfactory.—*The Boarding-out System Vindicated.* Bristol: Arrowsmith, 1872.

fatal. Among all the endless paradoxes of female treatment, one of the worst and most absurd is that which, while eternally proclaiming "home" to be the only sphere of a woman, systematically educates all the female children of the State, without attempting to give them even an idea of what a home might be. Girls want affection, want personal care, want household duties, want everything which can train them to honour their bodies and keep pure the souls which God has given them. To effect this, we mass them by hundreds where they have no affection, no personal care, nay, hardly a personal existence at all save as units in a herd, no household duties, and as much degradation as hideous uniforms and cropped hair, and shoes which change the natural lightness of the step of youth to the shuffle of age, can possibly achieve. The result is becoming at last so palpable that none may shut their eyes. The poor girls so trained go out into the humbler class of service, where their ignorance of the simplest household duties, their lack of self-control, and hopeless stupidity, too often provoke the harshness of their employers. In their errands in the street at all hours the secret of another and all too easy livelihood is revealed to them. No mother or friendly teacher is there to save them, no house to which to go when dismissed from service, save the weary workhouse again. Before they return thither they try that dread alternative. Out of a single workhouse in London, inquiry was instituted two years ago concerning eighty girls who had left it and gone to service,—it was found every one of them was on the streets.'[1]

'I can affirm one thing on my own experience,' says elsewhere the same eloquent writer, 'and that is this, that one of the largest channels through which young lives are drained down into the dead sea which underlies all our vaunted civilisation is the workhouse.'[2]

The late Mr. Kekewich, M.P., speaking at the first

[1] *The Philosophy of the Poor Laws.* London: Trübner & Co., 1865.
[2] *Friendless Girls and How to Help Them,* by Frances Power Cobbe. London: Victoria Press.

annual meeting of the Home opened by Miss Twining for workhouse girls, said, 'for some time he had been chairman of one of the largest rural unions, and he knew the defects of the law. One of the most difficult points was the bringing up of children within the walls of a workhouse. Even if they were well cared for, there was something in the very atmosphere of a workhouse which was contaminating. What was it? He believed the reason of their failure to be that they did not know the meaning of the word, "home."'

Nor is this feeling of the necessity of a home merely sentimental. The development of affection, the desire for love and sympathy, cannot be suppressed without outraged nature asserting herself in some other direction; if these be neglected, the result is either vice or dense stupidity. Even putting higher motives aside, it is bad policy not to provide a home for these children, where they would form relationships and create interest among people of their own station, who could give them more efficient help in after life than can patrons, however kindly.

Happily there is general improvement to record in the care now taken in choosing the girls' first places. Employers of doubtful means and character, or whose calling in life might lead to bad acquaintances, are more likely than not to be refused; and either by voluntary co-operation or better arrangements by guardians, a more efficient supervision is usually maintained. But where this is still given by the relieving officer, the law requires no more than that he shall visit the girl while in her first place. On leaving it, she has no further claim on the guardians or any one else, if orphaned or deserted; and must, so far as poor law administration is concerned, carry on her solitary struggle as best she can. All the trials of service and of the first start in life are intensified under these circumstances. It is a false position on both sides, and one which leads inevitably to unintentional misrepresentations.

Official returns and statements in these cases need independent verification. There is no intention to deceive,

but circumstances are favourable to confusion. Take for instance the duplication of names. In a large school it is not infrequent to find the same Christian and surname belonging to different children; and in the case of boy or girl returning to the workhouse, there may be the further confusion of the father or mother bearing the same appellation. There is, too, readiness to accept favourable reports confidingly, and on the part of an official an unconscious bias to show a good report for his union, occasioned by *esprit de corps*. We have been ourselves emphatically assured by the chaplain of a large workhouse, who might be supposed to speak with authority, that *none* of the girls brought up in their schools ever returned disgraced to the house; the matron, who had a keener eye for faces and a better memory, told a very different tale.

Testimony such as we have given from workhouse officials, guardians, and independent observers, as to the evils of pauper education, might be multiplied *ad infinitum;* but we have cited enough to prove that there are still a vast number of children growing up in our midst, under the complete control of the State, whom she is educating at great expense, not for God's service, but for the devil's!

But a better state of things is now gaining ground in various directions, in proportion usually to the voluntary co-operation accepted by guardians; and it may be voluntary, although rendered by an official, in the sense that it is help bestowed outside official duty. We have such an instance in the good work done many years ago in Wolverhampton workhouse by its matron, Mrs. Mead, described by her at a London conference.[1]

As regards the metropolis, efficient supervision is now given to all workhouse girls, for whom their respective Boards of Guardians permit it, by the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants, founded by the late Mrs. Nassau Senior, in consequence of knowledge obtained by her in investigating the after-career of girls educated in district schools; an association which will be described

[1] *Sessional Proceedings of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science*, vol. xvi. No. 3, 1882-83.

in detail when we treat of voluntary agencies in connection with the poor law. The Girls' Friendly Society extends the same advantage to country girls. The excellent Homes for Working Boys in London, and similar institutions in some of the large provincial towns, are being more and more utilised by guardians for the lads they place out from the schools.

The protection these valuable organisations give is more and more needed for boys as the practice of apprenticeship declines. It scarcely survives now except as practised by Boards of Guardians, and is rapidly losing favour with them. With doubtless honourable exceptions, the class of masters who apply, and the frequency with which on one side or the other the agreement is broken after the second moiety of the premium has been paid, show that a method, once most desirable as restoring the lad to family life, is now out of date. Thus the boy who goes to work from the pauper school in these days usually becomes a lodger, and his own master. The difficulties and dangers of such a position are obvious, and the Home which provides him at a price within his means with wholesome food and shelter, and accords to him the advantages of its evening classes taught by volunteers interested in his welfare, who also encourage his healthy recreation, and which makes him the member of what is practically a well-ordered club, does very much to raise him into the position of a respectable industrious citizen. The benefits given considerably exceed in cost what he can when first a wage-earner afford to pay, and contributions from Boards of Guardians and private benevolence are needed; but the more nearly the lad can feel he is, or soon will be, self-supporting the better.

Apprenticeship to the sea, contrary to that on land, is rising in estimation. If the master be well chosen, this is a good method of starting hardy lads in life; and at some of the ports frequented by fishing smacks, there are well-ordered Homes for the boys, when on shore.

The Rev. R. H. Hadden, Guardian of the City of London Union, in his evidence before the Committee on Poor Relief (House of Lords, 1888), urged such alterations

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in the regulations under which pauper boys are now indentured as would sanction their becoming outdoor apprentices, when the guardians might arrange for their living in a Boys' Home, and supported his proposal with facts showing the failure of apprenticeship in its present form.

Since the first edition of this book appeared, the passing of the Elementary Education Act, with its compulsory clauses, and the establishment of rate-supported schools, have made the provision for the education of the poorer classes a national undertaking. The guardians of three hundred and twenty-four unions, or one-half of all in England and Wales, have wisely taken advantage of the opportunities thus afforded to cease levying a subsidiary education rate; they send the children under their charge to outside schools instead of maintaining one of their own. Irrespective of improved teaching power and economy, it is an immense advantage that these children should thus learn to look upon themselves as belonging to general society instead of to a limited and despised class. They get fuller exercise of mind and body; in the outer world they associate freely with other children; the pauper uniform is generally (and should be always) abolished, that they may not be marked; and they escape for a period every day from the gloom and evil influences of the workhouse. In some unions it is thought necessary by the guardians to send them under escort, and if an adult pauper performs the duty the children must be recognised in going to and fro as belonging to the workhouse. But it is more usual to allow them to go unattended (as they would from their own homes); and sometimes they take their school pence in their hands—excellent, we think, wherever feasible. The reports of their progress are favourable, and the regularity of their attendance, and of the payments on their behalf, generally recommend them to the school authorities. Occasionally an objection is raised to admitting them on the score of their inferiority to the other scholars; but as, if they had been living outside the workhouse walls, they must, under the regulations of the Education Act,

have been received, the objection seems as illogical as it is legally untenable and selfish.[1]

This plan, desirable in all other respects, has, however, the serious drawback that the doing away with a school staff within the workhouse may cause the children to be left without superintendence out of school hours. An officer appointed for this duty only must be paid out of the local rates, whereas the school teacher, whose duties include such superintendence, is a charge upon the State, and the temptation to guardians to save the rates is strong. But the more enlightened of them know that whatever disconnects the children from the workhouse is economy in the end. In all but very small workhouses, where industrial training can be given by the master and matron, an officer is needed for this purpose when the children receive schooling outside, and superintendence may then be combined with the other duties of the trainer.

Sunday is usually a dreary and most unprofitable day to workhouse children, and may become additionally so where the school teacher has been abolished. Sometimes a kind-hearted guardian or visitor will devote Sunday leisure to them; but admission to the Sunday school of their district would do even more to give the day brightness and turn hours too often lounged away in mischievous idleness to good account. The Rev. J. Stubbs, vicar of Huish Episcopi, Somerset, wrote in March 1887 to the *Standard*, describing the experiment he had made of admitting the children from a neighbouring workhouse into his Sunday school. Although the plan has not yet been long enough in operation to afford tangible results, it is clear, we learn from Mr. Stubbs, that the workhouse children appreciate the privilege, and are improved by their contact with their fellows in public worship. They are, he says, 'more boyish and girlish' than they were, and his kindly experiment will, we hope, lead to an adoption of the plan wherever practicable.

Another pleasant way of breaking down the barriers

[1] See *Leaflet No.* 10, issued by the Association for the Advancement of Boarding-Out, March 1888.

between workhouse children and those in the outer world is allowing them to compete for prizes offered sometimes to schools by societies for promoting good needlework, wood-carving, and other like objects. Pauper girls have thus received prizes in the Town Hall of Birmingham, on the occasion of their distribution by a local association, and it cannot be doubted that success so acknowledged must have an invigorating effect, not only on the individuals but their companions also.

While noting with thankfulness improvements such as these in the education of our juvenile paupers, we must not forget that many abuses remain, and will remain, we fear, as long as the workhouse is used as home and school. But there is a growing sense of responsibility towards these young creatures, and a recognition that their often perverse behaviour and its sad consequences are due quite as much to faults and errors in their early training as to the inherent naughtiness or stupidity to which they were formerly attributed; and we trust that the time is not far distant when the sentencing them to a childhood in the workhouse will be counted as a mistake of the past, and condemned by enlightened experience, as many another once approved method of education has been.

Meanwhile our narrative may serve not only as a record, but also as a warning. Science has discovered that the germs of disease may be buried for years and years, to burst forth again, when the earth is stirred or some other impulse given them—a power for deadly mischief! So, too, there is seemingly an indestructible and recurring life in men's thoughts and ideas, and the seeds of half-forgotten errors may spring up in renewed vigour when reformers have fondly hoped they were for ever destroyed. The last grain of evil will have to be annihilated if we would be assured that no such baneful revival shall darken the path of these children in the future.

CHAPTER III

SEPARATE AND DISTRICT SCHOOLS ON THE BARRACK, BLOCK, AND COTTAGE HOMES SYSTEMS

'When we are to provide for the education of any body of men, we ought seriously to consider the particular functions they are to perform in life.'—HERBERT SPENCER.

'In these mimic experiments of education, there is always something which distinguishes them from reality; some weak part left unfortified for the arrows of misfortune to find their way into it.'—LÆTITIA BARBAULD.

'Through child slavery you will never fit any one for free manhood.'—REV. EDMUND V. PIGOTT.

'The law is useful to them for their perfection, but the difference is needful to them for their life.'—J. RUSKIN.

AFTER the account just given of workhouses and of the schools within their walls—public institutions under State inspection, not private dwellings where wrong may flourish undisturbed and nothing be ever heard of it—it may naturally occur to the reader to inquire what the inspectors were doing while so much evil was spreading its root downwards and bearing fruit upwards.

The answer is, that they were diligently inspecting—that without their labours the evil would have been far greater, and so also the difficulty of obtaining trustworthy testimony as to the real state of things, and of rousing public attention to the absolute necessity for reform. Nor have they, by any means, limited themselves to their prescribed duty.

They have been on the watch to suggest improvements, and long since several of their body, pre-eminently Mr. Carleton Tufnel, deeply impressed with the urgent need for removing children from the influences of workhouse

life, especially from intercourse with adult paupers, eagerly co-operated with Sir James Kay Shuttleworth, Mr. Edwin Chadwick, and other noted men, who were pressing forward the creation of distinct establishments for their upbringing.

Thus it was that separate and district schools came into existence, the former receiving the children of one parish or union only, managed by its own Board of Guardians; the latter the children of more than one parish or union, advantage being taken for this purpose of an Act passed in 1844 and amended in 1848, which authorised, within certain limits, the combination of unions, with power to erect buildings and otherwise act together. Thus district schools are managed by a committee of representative guardians, together with, in some rare cases, nominees of the Local Government Board. On the ground of economy of administration they were expected to be particularly advantageous to unions too small to supply a sufficient number of children to fill a separate school. We shall show later how far this hope has been justified by results.

The original scheme was to settle the children in comparatively small groups of about forty each, under paid superintendence, in unused workhouses or other available buildings ready to hand. When this plan was abandoned, Sir J. Kay Shuttleworth still urged that the number in one school should not exceed 500. Even this advice was disregarded; and although in the light of experience it will be seen that 500 is certainly too large a number, yet had the proposed limit been adopted, much evil would have been avoided which beset the schools when, in the false hope of securing economy and ease of administration, more and more children were admitted, until they exceeded in at least one instance (Sutton) by nearly four times the originally suggested bounds.

It is true that, a few years ago, the Local Government Board, recognising the terrible evils of such agglomeration, reverted to the proposal of Sir J. Kay Shuttleworth, and issued a recommendation to that effect. Nevertheless there are still existing three schools of over 500 children,

one over 600, two over 700, and another over 1000, besides that already mentioned containing more than 1800 children, though some of the latter happily have been removed to separate blocks. All these schools are in the metropolitan district. In the provinces the schools receiving children from large towns, as Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, etc., exceed, and too far exceed, the limit of 500 each.

The principle dominating the theory on which these institutions were founded was based on the belief that intercourse with adult paupers was the fatal source of contamination and corruption, and that if this were stopped and improved training given, together with a moderate amount of elementary teaching, all that was necessary for the children's welfare would be done. The schools have in consequence generally the advantage of being in a country, or at least suburban, district, and are sometimes several miles distant from the workhouse. But there are instances in which the separate school stands within the workhouse precincts, and is merely disconnected from the main building; in such cases isolation from the adults is, as we have shown, impossible.

To ensure thorough industrial training an adequate staff of paid officers and servants, helped by and teaching the girls intended for service, and the boys in various occupations, was substituted for unpaid pauper teachers and caretakers; but in all other respects these schools are genuine pauper institutions under the same poor law regulations as the workhouse, and indeed generally forming part of it. Thus, excepting when sent to employment direct from the schools, the children must return to the workhouse to be 'discharged'—the technical term for restoration to the outside world. As in the workhouse, the children almost invariably wear a uniform, bear the stigma of an outcast class, are herded together, are taught, fed, tended, trained, and cared for wholesale. They are rarely classified, except in regard to age and sex, and the 'ins and outs,' with scant exceptions, mix with the permanent children without restraint. Under these circum-

stances it is not surprising to find many of the worst defects of workhouse life cropping up in the schools, in spite of their large staffs and costly organisation.

The evils here pointed out may, however, be greatly modified by thought and care. To show what may be accomplished by a good separate school, we give a brief history of the children's establishment at Limehouse, formerly the school for Stepney union.

Forty-eight years ago the workhouse school of that parish was found to be most unsatisfactory. The boys lived with the adult male paupers: lying, cheating, and stealing were declared to be their chief characteristics; while the girls, although they had some time previously been separated from the women, displayed, equally with the lads, selfishness, stubbornness, and great coarseness of language and behaviour, together with the lack of any spirit of self-dependence. The work of reform was zealously pursued by the chairman of the union (the late Mr. G. F. Young) and the visiting committee. The children were transferred from the workhouse to a building nearly a mile distant; an excellent governor, schoolmaster, and mistress were appointed, with a sufficient staff of subordinate officers, and, most important of all perhaps, no pauper attendant was employed. The guardians, though exercising close supervision, having confidence in their officers avoided interference, giving them both power and responsibility; and kindly and individual treatment of the children was the result.

Besides the usual school instruction, the boys were taught shoemaking, tailoring, carpentering, and spinning; the girls laundry and house work, and a variety of sewing and knitting.

It had been the practice to send some of the lads to sea, and a premium of £10 was offered to any employer who would have them; but it was found that this plan attracted the masters of the lowest class of fishing-smacks, who took the children for the sake of the money, and often so ill-treated them that they would, if possible, abscond, often relapsing into pauperism, or even sinking into crime. The guardians determined therefore to erect the masts,

rigging, etc., of a full-sized ship in the schoolyard, and engaged a seaman to drill and train the boys. They soon became so expert as to be sought in larger numbers than could be supplied, by the captains of high-class trading vessels. As these, too, needed no premium, the guardians soon found the £100 spent on the ship an economy. All the boys were taught to swim, and practised in the rowing and management of a boat. This was before training-ships were established, and though these have superseded the plan adopted at Limehouse, it was an enterprising experiment at that time. Great attention was also paid to vocal and instrumental music, admission to the highest class being made a reward for good conduct, and many of the boys did thoroughly well in naval and military bands. The careful training of the girls for domestic service also produced very satisfactory results; while the few girls and boys who showed marked aptitude for teaching were carefully prepared for that avocation and sent to training-colleges. Several became masters and mistresses of schools, in receipt of good salaries.

Contact with adult paupers was so carefully guarded against, that those children who had parents in the workhouse were only allowed to visit them once in three months, and then accompanied by their nurse or teacher; for it is a melancholy fact that such parents are frequently the child's worst enemies, and one to which we shall have to refer only too often in succeeding pages.

The physical contamination from infectious diseases, especially of the skin, imported by the ins and outs, was guarded against by a probationary ward. There the newcomers had to remain till clean and well, unless previously discharged, in which case they never reached the main building at all.

Bad temper, especially amongst the ins and outs, was common, but serious moral offences were rare, the spirit of the school being so strongly on the side of right that the children themselves checked misconduct. One very pleasing feature was the annual excursion into the country, a reward really for good behaviour, as the privilege was forfeited if a

certain number of bad marks was shown. Nor was the children's pleasure limited to this summer outing. They had their Christmas treats, one of which was delightfully described by Mr. F. W. Robinson in *Belgravia* of November 1869.

While fully appreciating the training given at Limehouse, and sympathising with the kind efforts made to please and amuse the children, Mr. Robinson dexterously insinuates his disapprobation of the opportunity being seized 'to improve the occasion,' which sometimes threw a chill on the proceedings, and checked any temptation to exuberance of spirit in the little ones—a temptation rarely yielded to at the best of times, as the pauper child is a flat spiritless being even in his pleasures.

Another admirable provision by the guardians, in the then lack of a better one, was, that the pupils on leaving their first situation, if not through misconduct, were allowed to return to the school instead of entering the workhouse; and, what was then an advantage to them above price, they were most kindly visited in their places by Miss Young, the sister of the chairman of the board, who anticipated on a small scale the invaluable work, now performed by the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants. Her friendly advice and watchfulness doubtless saved many from those first thoughtless steps which lead to irretrievable ruin.

Limehouse, unfortunately, however, cannot be quoted as the general example of pauper schools. It was small, so that individual knowledge and supervision of each child was possible, and it had an admirable committee and zealous chairmen, Mr. Young being succeeded by Mr. John Charrington, who gave to the work that personal love and care which alone can secure prosperity.

These are conditions rarely to be met with. Where, however, they exist and the school is moderate in size, the full success of which it is capable will be attained; but in speaking of the system, we must take the whole and not the exceptions, nor count on finding the most favourable conditions everywhere.

It must be remembered, too, that the poor law guardian is usually a man already busy with private affairs. It is impossible for him to devote his life to the solution of the problem of pauper education; and even if he could and were in every way fit for the task, he is not an independent agent. The regulations of the Local Government Board, necessary to secure a certain uniformity throughout the country, inevitably hamper any departure from the ordinary track. Again, he must act in concert with his colleagues. Among the members of a board, differences of opinion exist to which he must defer. At best he may compromise, yielding points which he considers of lesser consequence to secure the more important. But probably his colleagues have never studied that difficult science, the education of other people's children, in all its aspects of moral, mental, and physical training, and are even unconscious that any study is demanded. The chance of their agreeing with him becomes infinitesimally small. The majority carry the day; they follow the beaten path; and the school, which was originally made as machine-like as possible to keep it going, becomes the slave of routine. New ideas and experiments are dreaded, variety puts it out of gear; and only those who have to deal with the huge concern understand the labour, the perplexity, the almost despair which the disruption of the ordinary course implies. Changes which, in a family or other household of natural size, cause neither difficulty nor discomfort, become really stupendous in their consequences when vast numbers have to be dealt with, and they are instinctively avoided. Thus the events of daily life are stereotyped for the inmates of our big schools, each day showing 'the dull likeness of the day before' in the monotonous grind of a machine-like existence.

Limehouse school and a very few others are bright exceptions, which simply prove the rule, and Limehouse now unhappily belongs to the past, the school having been closed in 1873, when the Local Government Board advised Stepney to join the South Metropolitan school district, and send its children to Sutton to supply the deficiency in numbers there. This is one instance among many of the

deplorable tendency to mass the children and centralise these institutions which has been growing for many years, but has, we trust, now begun to decline.

We will place Quatt school, for the south-east Shropshire district, in juxtaposition to the separate school at Limehouse, as an equally favourable specimen of the class to which it belongs. It owes its origin to the late Mr. Wolryche Whitmore, who in 1836 induced his fellow-guardians to open an industrial or 'labour' school for the children of Bridgnorth union. Those of Cleobury Mortimer, Madeley, Seisdon, and Newport and Shifnal unions, were admitted in 1851. It was established on his own estate, and remained until his death the object of his constant interest and care. It began with about 40 children of both sexes. The number is now 163, still comparatively very small. The boys cultivate the little farm of between 12 and 13 acres, which in 1887 produced milk, butter, vegetables, pork, calves, etc., at an estimated profit of £61 : 10 : 8. They also do the rougher house-work, while the girls help in the rest, besides sewing and knitting for themselves and the boys. The bigger children have gardens of their own, in which they take great delight—the chaplain, the Rev. H. B. Wolryche Whitmore, encouraging them by gifts of seeds, and prizes for the best cultivation. He has also established a savings bank for the children, and several have nice little amounts put by. There is a lending library, which owes some additions to the stock of books to the generosity of some former pupils, now well-to-do men, who also send other gifts to the children.

There are seven resident male and female officers, besides servants—a large staff perhaps, but it makes individual treatment possible, and to this, and the great interest taken in the children by the ladies and gentlemen connected with the school, its excellence is probably largely due. The school is free from rent, and has no repayments of loans and interest—that usually heavy item. Formerly the total weekly cost per child was about 5s.; it is now reduced to 4s. Such a diminution was foreshadowed by a

poor law Inspector, the late Mr. Jelinger Symons, who stated many years ago, with a view to establishing similar schools, that the expenses at Quatt might be very much reduced, especially if suitable buildings could be rented for the purpose, remarking—'So long as the essential requirements for the health of the inmates are observed, the rougher and homelier they are the better.'

When we described this school twenty years ago, the success in after life of the boys much exceeded that of the girls. We are not aware if this disparity still exists; but we are assured that great care is exercised in the selection of places for all, and that fully 80 per cent are known to do well.

The *Exmouth* training-ship affords an example of a very different district school, but one claiming a large proportion of success. She lies off Grays on the Essex shore of the Thames, about twenty miles below the port of London, and was converted to her present purpose in 1876. The ship is under the direction of the Metropolitan Asylums' Board, being managed by a committee of that body, which consists mainly of representative guardians from the Metropolitan Boards. The *Exmouth* receives lads from the Metropolitan unions, but not from other parts of the country. If the candidate for admission is not an orphan, the consent of his parents or surviving parent must be obtained, but it includes consent to his remaining until his training is completed, and to his engaging for twelve years' continuous service in the navy from the age of eighteen, or to his entering the mercantile marine. By this wise provision the loss of the heavy cost of his education, which their claiming him on discharge from the ship would entail, is avoided. To be eligible, boys must be between the ages of twelve and fifteen, healthy, without any defect in limbs, eyesight, or hearing, and up to a certain standard of height and girth. So stunted and physically defective as a class are the children who enter the Metropolitan workhouses, that but a small portion fulfil these conditions. Therefore it is the cream only as regards physical qualities who are

admitted to the ship. It has an admirable superintendent in Captain Bourchier, R.N., whose description of the *Exmouth*, given at the important conference on the bringing up and education of pauper children, held in March 1883, is of great interest;[1] and the all-round training and variety of wholesome influences brought to bear upon the lads account for the high percentage of success, estimated at 95, of those discharged to the sea or to military bands, and whose subsequent career is known.

The total number discharged up to 30th July 1888 was 3688—more than 2000 of these entered the navy or mercantile marine, but all do not of course remain, and those who leave are apt to be lost sight of. 430 went into military bands; but nearly 500, approaching a seventh of the whole, were discharged to their parishes. Still for lads capable and desirous of being turned into sailors, the *Exmouth* offers excellent means of training, though at heavy cost.

Training-ships are always expensive as compared with land schools, and the *Exmouth* is not an exception. The number on board approaches six hundred, the usual period passed on the ship is about two years. The annual cost per head has never, we believe, fallen below £30 (exclusive of loans and interest, probably £6 or £7 more), and frequently rises above it.

In the ordinary separate schools, and still more in the large district schools, we see intensified a main evil of workhouse life, viz. the suppression of the individual, and a Procustean rule applied without regard for modifying circumstances. Its presence is due partly to transmitted custom, so hard to break, but mainly to great numbers, which render strict discipline indispensable. This is a fact familiar to us in regard to soldiers, and where all are to act as one man with implicit obedience to the word of command, the more the individual is merged in the mass the better. But these children occupy a precisely opposite position.

[1] *Sessional Proceedings of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science*, vol. xvi. No. 31,882-3.

Our object must be so to train them as to enable each to stand alone, self-sustaining, and self-dependent at the earliest possible moment, and development instead of repression should be our aim. Again, for a child's development human love and sympathy are as essential as sunshine to the plants, but it is impossible for even the most lovingly disposed superintendents and teachers to bestow affection wholesale; simply to learn the names and identify all under their charge occupies a long period. A teacher at the London Central School at Hanwell had not accomplished it after more than a year's residence, although a man with, we believe, his heart in his work. Yet till this elementary bit of knowledge is gained, individual influence is out of the question. How much more is needed we may learn in the following words from a writer of practical experience: —'The superintendent or headmaster should be personally and intimately acquainted with every individual boy committed to his charge. However skilled and efficient his assistant masters, the headmaster must be known to, and must know, every one of his boys; each of them must feel that he has in his leader an intimate and zealous, even a loving friend. In the schoolroom, in the playground, in each workshop, the headmaster's active, skilful, and affectionate training of his boys must be felt by every one of them—not merely his arrangements or influence, but his personal rule. He must be held responsible for the training of every boy, for his health, his fair share of work and play, his moral and religious progress, and his general happiness in his adopted home. The superintendent of a school of 1000 boys can with difficulty keep up sufficiently close acquaintance even with his staff of assistants—who, I estimate, must number fifty, including school teachers, workmen in the various shops, drill sergeants, matrons, etc.'[1] Mr. Bell writes only of boys, but his remarks apply with equal if not greater force to girls.

A remarkable example of the absence of individual knowledge occurred recently at a large town workhouse.

[1] Letter from Mr. G. W. Bell, Honorary Secretary to the Boys' Home, Regent's Park Road.—*Times*, Sept. 16, 1885.

A member of a boarding-out committee was seeking children eligible for foster-homes; among those suitable was an engaging little girl of about three. Then and not till then was it discovered that the poor little thing was speechless. Yet she had been four months in the workhouse and under a very kind matron, round whom the children, including this little one, would flock for caresses when she came among them. Moreover, the circumstances of her admission (she was found deserted in the fields, with evidences of belonging to a superior class) would presumably excite a special interest. But the matron had sixty (only sixty!) children to 'mother' as best she could, besides her multifarious other duties. The foster-parents consented to *try* the child, with the proviso that if the infirmity proved permanent they might return her to the workhouse; but they soon became so attached to her that parting seems improbable.

The want of alertness and general capacity and adaptability characteristic of the pauper class prevails in the big school, whether it be in the workhouse or miles away. The children, habituated to an unbroken routine, become dull, apathetic, and unable to accommodate themselves to different conditions, or any kind of change. A girl sent to her first place and supplied with a candle on going to bed, came down again, with a request that her mistress would be so kind as to show her the tap to turn out the light, as she could not find it. Accustomed only to gas, she was unable to imagine any other method of extinguishing it.

Besides this narrowed experience, limited exclusively in the case of the permanent children to what happens within the school walls, dependent habits are acquired which would never be tolerated in small households. There is necessarily a staff of servants who have to act as nurses, and are at the same time supposed to teach the children to dress themselves, and keep themselves neat. Every one, however, who has had to start a small child in managing for itself knows what a tedious process it is, and that it is much easier to dress a child than to teach it to be independent. Multiply the one child of private life by the hundred who

may in a school fall to a single nurse's charge, and we see at once the strength of the temptation, if not the necessity, of dealing with all *en bloc* instead of instructing each in the art of self-help. A lady visiting the Destitute Asylum in one of our colonies found the children preparing to go out for a treat. To her surprise great boys were being passed under the hair-brush, and on asking if they could not brush their own hair—'No,' answered the attendant who was doing it for them, 'they can do nothing for themselves. We have to wait on them hand and foot. They can't put on their own clothes.' Shocked at this, the lady asked about the girls, and was told they were equally helpless. Hoping the account was exaggerated, she went to them as they were standing in the yard ready to start, and offered a penny to the one who had put on her own hat and shawl. Though some of the girls were thirteen, there was not one who could claim the reward. This may be an extreme case, and it led to inquiry and subsequent reform in the school in question; but it is quoted to show the kind of training which the children massed together are apt to receive. A substitute for individual teaching is thus sought for in a certain mechanical drill, where individual stupidity and ignorance are hidden in united effort.

Strangers, indeed, we believe, are invariably pleased by the neatness, order, and discipline which usually pervade these schools—all good in their way—tending to create an *esprit de corps*, in some measure a substitute for the bond of family affection; but they must not be permitted to destroy individuality, and the limits within which they can be safely employed are soon reached. 'By training a child as one in a hundred,' says Miss Hesba Stretton, 'we produce a machine, and generally a bad machine.'

Enforced uniformity in every detail of daily life, however important or however trifling, among creatures varying in mind as much as in body, though seductive to the disciplinarian, is blighting to those subjected to its laws. Undoubtedly some mysterious charm affects the beholder in witnessing many hundreds of children, dressed alike, acting in unison, and rendering instant obedience to the

word of command; but even amid the tears that dim our eyes,[1] when their young voices, implicitly following a sign from their teacher, join in the merry song or evening hymn, we are constrained to ask,—How will individuality of character develop itself from this complete subjection to the will of others, from the routine of duty, which leaves open no temptation to wrong, and annihilates the choice of right? Yet without such individuality can moral beauty or strength exist? 'The individual,' said a writer in the *Westminster Review*, 'becomes a mere cog in an engine of many wheels, whereas in real life it has to be itself a many-wheeled engine."[2]

That to the officers the smooth working of their vast machine, composed of elements originally so rude and discordant as the offscourings of London, should be a source of pride we cannot marvel; and were their pupils always to remain *in situ*, we might perhaps allow ourselves to indulge an almost unmixed admiration of the success of their patient and devoted labours. But we know, alas! that each component part will be wrenched, while hardly beyond childhood, from the support of companions and the protection of teachers; and painful distrust arises of the capacity of each poor little unit, nay, each poor little *naught* rather, for it has never learned to stand alone, to keep itself from falling in the battle of life. Some show indeed is made by the State of placing her aegis over these her children. Until better arrangements were made the law required that for two years after they departed from the school they should be visited by the relieving officer or chaplain, who inquired and registered their employer's opinion of their conduct. We have ourselves been told by chaplains of these schools that their great trouble was the disappearance of the girls in service, making supervision for the appointed period frequently impossible.

[1] A member of a committee of guardians of one of the metropolitan schools is reported to have remarked on such an occasion, that it was one of the best treats he had had for a long time. To see the little dears enter the dining hall was indeed a grand sight. He had to blow his nose and wipe his eyes, and the working of the institution was admirable.

[2] April 1870.

But even this amount of surveillance ceases when the object attained the age of sixteen. Our Poor Law makes twenty-one as the earliest period at which the children shall be entrusted to those who usually are the only persons by relatives able to counsel and protect them. Thus the friendless pauper orphan is competent to act for itself years earlier, when often it has its whole experience of the world to learn, and the fiery ordeal to sustain character just beginning to awake.

The result of the conditions of life we have sought to describe is only too precisely what was to be expected, viz. that when the boys and girls brought up in the schools go to work, their employers constantly complain of their general want of 'go,' and their stupidity, even if more serious failings are not discovered. An inspector speaks of a mistress who surmised that the girls were taught entirely by old people, while another, more correctly, supposed they were taught in batches, and therefore were unable to carry on their work when called upon to act alone.[1] It may be urged that the schools have greatly improved since Mrs. Senior inspected them. That they have improved we thankfully admit, due in no small degree to her suggestions and action, but the dulness she recorded abides with the children still. While writing we have been told by a lady of long experience that she usually finds the district-school girl in capacity and power of independent action about two years behind her companion brought up at home. She spoke also of the intense, unreasoning, and unaccountable obstinacy these poor creatures at times display. Without any apparent cause they maintain a sullen silence, will refuse to eat, or do anything they are asked to do; and we know that sometimes months, and even years, elapse before this unnatural habit of mind is overgotten.

Mr. Hardcastle, *ex officio* guardian for St. George's, Hanover Square, stated before the Lords' Poor Relief Committee [1888]—The 'district schools are far too large [elsewhere he proposes 200 as the limit of number], the children

[1] Appendix to the *Report of the Local Government Board for* 1873-74, report by Mrs. Nassau Senior.

wordsome mere machines. . . . Certainly, speaking for our union, it has been a great misfortune and a great expense, and no advantage, as far as I know, sending them down to these district schools. . . . A child leaves the school at the age of twelve or thirteen, and cannot tell the time by the clock, and thinks that the water that runs down automatically for it to wash with has something to do with the rain that comes down from heaven.'[1]

Nor is this experience of the numbing effects of these large institutions, where work must necessarily be done partly by machinery, always by machine-like rules, limited to England. The report of the committee of managers upon the hospital children at Paisley, as far back as 1839, says—'It has likewise been observed from experience that the children who have been reared in hospitals [the old name for charity schools] are greatly deficient in those habits of industry and frugality on which their future happiness so much depends. They are removed from the salutary example of the labouring classes of society, and deprived of the only opportunity of being practically instructed as to the inseparable union betwixt industry and plenty, and, from the defects of the very system itself, are dismissed without any knowledge of the true value of the means of a common livelihood, and wholly ignorant of the difficulty which in every other condition of life must be experienced in their attainment.' And again, in a report of later date—'We believe that children brought up in public institutions, when at length turned out into the world, are as a general rule feeble in body and mind, and less able to fight their way through life than those who come from the common walks of society.'[2] We quote only some of many passages referring in the same tone to the hospitals for children of various ranks in Scotland. These institutions resemble our district schools, in so far as that in them large numbers of children are brought up together on the monastic system as it has been called, the results of which

[1] *Report of the Select Committee on Poor Relief* [*H.L.*], 1888.

[2] *Report on Boarding-out Pauper Children in Scotland*, by J. J. Henley, Esq., Inspector for the Poor Law Board, 1870.

have proved so unsatisfactory that the ancient hospitals of Edinburgh, for centuries her pride, have one after the other been converted to day schools, the pupils being boarded in suitable families when not possessing homes of their own.

Ireland contributes her experience of similar institutions to the same effect. In her Protestant Charter Schools (closed sixty years ago in consequence of the evil bred by the system of seclusion on which they were conducted) 'the children,' says an eye-witness, 'are comfortably lodged, well clad, and abundantly fed. No pains are spared to preserve their health. On the first appearance of disease medical aid is procured, and their teachers are in all cases equal, and generally far superior, to those employed in the daily and parochial schools. Yet I was invariably struck with the vast superiority in health, in appearance, in vivacity, and in intelligence of the half-naked and, one would almost suppose, half-starved children who live in their parents' cabins over those so well maintained and so carefully instructed in the Charter Schools. The reasons of this striking effect it might not be difficult to assign. In the Charter Schools all social and family affections are dried up; children once received into them are, as it were, the children, the brothers, the sisters, the relations, of—nobody! They have no holidays, they know not the feeling of home, and hence it is primarily, whatever concomitant causes there may be, that they are so frequently stunted in body, mind, and heart.'[1] We might imagine ourselves to be reading a description of orphan or deserted children brought up in a district school. M. Peyron, the able and devoted director of the department of *Le Service des Moralement Abandonnés* of the Seine, bears like testimony. 'In short, these schools' [*i.e.* schools which have also to be homes] 'keep the child,' he says, 'ignorant of real life, and teach him nothing of the struggle for existence. In them he acquires dependent habits which he will have speedily to forget. On leaving the school he is astonished to find that food, lodging, and all other necessaries are really payment for work, punctuality, and economy,'—a lesson at least as important as reading,

[1] *First Report of Irish Education Inquiry*, 1825.

writing, and other subjects of elementary instruction, however well taught—not that we would disparage these. We only maintain that a practical knowledge of the affairs of life is at least as needful.

In confirmation of these remarks as regards England, we again cite the report of the late Mrs. Nassau Senior, who was appointed in 1873 by the President of the Local Government Board, Mr. Stansfeld, to give him 'the woman's view as to the effect on girls of the system of education in pauper schools.'[1] Although the scope of her inquiry was limited to girls, she was led incidentally to note its effect on boys also, and to conclude that it was unsatisfactory, though perhaps not to the same extent as upon the other sex. Her words are—'A girl is not necessarily a better woman because she knows the height of all the mountains of Europe, and can work out a fraction in her head; but she is decidedly better fitted for the duties she will be called upon to perform in life if she knows how to wash and tend a child, cook simple food well, and thoroughly clean a house'; and again, 'I believe that apart from the supreme necessity of improving their moral condition, their wits would be very much sharpened by a greater variety of occupations, more general reading, more amusement, and more cultivation of natural sympathy.' Make 'the children human,' as Mr. Matthew Arnold hath it.

Separate and district schools attract teachers of perhaps a higher class than the workhouse school, and the instruction given is on a more ambitious scale, though here, of course, much depends on the staff. If the school be fortunate in this respect, the scholars may attain a fair proficiency in the limited subjects of instruction open to them. The permanent children have indeed apparently full opportunities for doing so, as these never leave the school unless for the rare event of a day's holiday. Consequently they are always on the spot, and can work without interruption

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1873-74.—Mrs. Nassau Senior's report is an invaluable contribution to the authoritative literature of our subject, and may with great advantage be used, both for study and reference, by those desirous of improving the condition of pauper children.

except so far as their teachers' vacations interfere—a doubtful advantage, decidedly tending, we should think, to the proverbial making of Jack a dull boy.

But the dulness is not to be accounted for only by the absence of amusement: it is a mental defect arising also from want of stimulus to thought. Mr. Mozley remarks—'The task is in their [the teachers'] case more difficult, for workhouse children, having a much smaller knowledge of the outer world, present much fewer points which a teacher can take hold of for purposes of illustration and application than other children do. It is a difficulty in which experience aids but slowly to know on what subject to speak to workhouse children so as to excite in them an interest.'[1] Mr. Wyndham Holgate refers also to 'the naturally weak intelligence of these children, increased as it too often is by the narrowness of vision induced by life in an institution.'[2] Formerly it was attempted to utilise this mental training of the permanent children by promoting the cleverer among them to be pupil teachers in the schools. But the plan had to be abandoned; the same causes which told against their being bright scholars affected their teaching capacity. Their minds were cramped and their sympathies narrowed, so that they had scant power to arouse interest or enthusiasm; and, worst objection of all, they brought no breezy, wholesome outside influence to ripple the stagnant level of pauper life. The average pauper scholar is, we fear, chiefly noticeable for a certain stolid, apathetic dulness, due perhaps in some to constitutional temperament, but as certainly created and increased by the routine of a singularly joyless and loveless life.

There are, however, divergent opinions on this matter; but supposing the educational success of the permanents be accepted as a fact, the reason alleged for it is surely mournful, viz. that they have no other interest in life but their lessons. 'Workhouse children make more rapid progress, I believe,' says Mr. Bowyer, incidentally controverting the opinion of Mr. Mozley, 'than other children of

[1] *Local Government Board Report*, 1874-75.
[2] *Ibid.* 1885-86

the labouring classes, as the seclusion and monotony of their lives render study less irksome than it is to those who are reared amid more cheerful surroundings.'[1]

On the other hand, it is believed by those possessing no official connection with poor law institutions, but whose experience outside gives weight to their opinion, that this constant and monotonous school life, after a time so dulls the perceptions and blunts the interests of the children, that they not only cease to progress themselves, but actually retard the others. Certainly remarkable confirmation of this opinion is afforded by the experience of the school of Aston parish, now virtually part of Birmingham. All the permanent children have for some years been boarded out, yet 93 per cent of those remaining in the school in 1887 obtained a better average of passes than is shown in schools containing permanent children.

Marked improvement on former years was also shown at the St. Pancras schools by the result of the inspector's examinations in 1887, almost all the permanent children—those, namely, eligible for boarding-out—having been removed for some years previously.

Yet the greater success without the permanents cannot be attributed to any inherent dulness on their part. Restored to the conditions of ordinary life, they do at least as well as their school companions in the elementary schools they now attend. We have before us recent returns from five elementary schools attended by boarded-out children, several of whom come from the pauper school just mentioned. At one of these elementary schools, indeed, the general average of passes was about 87 per cent, while that for the boarded-out children reached only 85; but in another, with a general average of 86, there were only three single failures (*i.e.* in one subject) among the boarded-out children, so that their success was nearly 100 per cent. In another, of the five boarded-out children attending, three passed 100 per cent, the other two had each a single failure. In another, with a general average upon two years of over 92 per cent, the boarded-out children

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1873-74.

passed cent per cent with one exception, a delicate girl, who failed each year in one subject.

In regard to the unfavourable influence of permanent children upon the pauper schools, the two instances mentioned are of little value upon which to found an argument, but they probably might be multiplied; and taken together with the success just noted at elementary schools, support, so far as they go, the inference that the big residence-school system stunts the intellect.

But even if it were granted that the mental instruction in large pauper schools may be fairly successful, the industrial training needs much improvement, and considering the important issues dependent on it, it cannot be too carefully studied. The plan of teaching the duties of domestic service by servants rarely answers. A servant's first desire is to get her work finished, and it is almost impossible for an efficient person of that class to stand by patiently and see an awkward pupil doing her work badly and yet resist the impulse to set her aside, instead of, by teaching, help her gradually to improve. Moreover, the post does not attract a high class of servants, as it leads to no advancement; those, too, who take it have a tendency to pet the more attractive children, and to treat the more repulsive with harshness. Evils must arise anywhere from such a *régime*, but they are intensified in the pauper school by their present effect upon children entirely under the dominion of teachers; and future failure must result when the pupils are thrown upon their own resources, and prove destitute of the trained capacity essential to success.

But even if the teacher—housemaid or cook—do her duty, the monotonous drudgery of scrubbing long passages and large rooms, and washing hundreds of cups and plates, or cleaning knives and boots in similar numbers, or preparing bushels of vegetable for the huge steam-boiler, cannot but give a distaste for work disastrous to those who must depend upon it for their living. To the disgust thus inspired may be traced much of the spiritless manner, or absolute laziness, which are the despair of employers. Then, too, the teaching must be given under great disadvantages, when

everything must be on a large scale, making it impossible to convey lessons of thrift and ingenious management—lessons which come naturally in the cottage home, where discussion and planning give zest to any little treat, and where the price and staying qualities of food are anxiously inquired into before purchase.

The elaborate arrangements, kitcheners, hot and cold water pipes, etc., indispensable in these huge buildings, further unfit the girls for the ordinary rough and ready appliances of small households. Another reason for disappointment in the results of industrial training both of boys and girls, is undoubtedly the tendency to turn their work to the advantage of the establishment as soon as they have mastered rudiments, instead of carrying them on to higher proficiency. Thus the young gardeners are kept to weeding, grass-rolling, etc., and the girls at passage scrubbing and rough mending in the needle-room; the shoemakers and tailors at cobbling for the good of the institution, but much to their own ultimate deterioration. This point has constantly been insisted upon by Mr. Wyndham Holgate. In his report for 1885 he remarks, 'To my thinking the full meaning of education, whether industrial or mental, will never be grasped, its full result will never be attained, so long as there remains any inclination on the part of school committees to utilise the labour or the handicraft of the children, as a means of reducing the cost of the establishment, which was erected for their education and for no other purpose.'[1] The temptation to school managers to utilise the children's work comes from the great cost the establishments entail, urging them to save wherever possible; but we believe with Mr. Holgate that, as it diminishes the children's chance of success in life, it is a very mistaken economy.

In contrast with these 'Pauper Palaces,' as Dickens calls them, we may study Mr. Bowyer's description of Hartismere Separate School, which, he says, 'still occupies the same rough old farmhouse, which it was in 1847, . . . the whole building having the appearance of a temporary make-

[1] *Local Government Board Report*, 1885-86.

shift.' The master and mistress were, however, thoroughly good, and he adds, 'Notwithstanding these defects [those namely of structure], I believe that this humble establishment has done as useful a work in rescuing the children educated in it from pauperism, as if it had been erected at a great expense and lavishly provided with all the conveniences to be found in the newest district school. Indeed, I am convinced that a certain degree of roughness and a certain amount of inconvenience in the arrangements of such schools (especially in a purely agricultural district) is a better preparation for the duties of a labourer or artisan, or for those of their wives, than the theoretically more perfect appliances so much in vogue.'[1]

We are tempted to suggest an amended reading, and to substitute 'greatly in consequence of' instead of 'notwithstanding,' as the girls going from this school to some small household do not find themselves suddenly called upon to do their usual work under quite unusual conditions, and with unfamiliar tools, and so we may hope are saved much discouragement and awkwardness, and consequent fault-finding and reproof.

There is significance, too, in the regret expressed by Mr. Bowyer, that 'so excellent a school should have so few scholars,' the 'numbers not exceeding fifty.' Here, again, to us are cause and effect, small numbers admitting of more individual teaching and more easily acquired knowledge.

But unfortunately a mechanical and artificial existence is not the only nor the worst feature of workhouse life reproduced in the costly schools. Except, indeed, in so far as pauper parents have a right to visit their children, adult pauper influence is guarded against in schools at a distance from the workhouse; but only very rarely are precautions taken against the equally pernicious influence of the youthful paupers, as represented chiefly by the 'ins and outs,' who enter the school when destitution or crime drives their parents to the workhouse or the prison, and who leave with them to pursue a career of mendicancy or

[1] *Local Government Board Report*, 1873-74.

other evil courses when the restraint of the workhouse has become intolerable or the sentence has expired.[1]

'It is a common occurrence for parents to take out their children [from the workhouse] for a night or two. Whilst out the children witness the immoral conduct of their mothers and make it the topic of conversation with their companions on their return. This is nearly a weekly occurrence, and so notorious as to require no evidence.'[2] Again in the same report, farther on, we read, 'the mischief is done in the playground and dormitories. There they are under little or no surveillance. The Arabs and the children of the dissolute, that have learned in so many months what it takes years and years in the other class even to imagine, disseminate their vices broadcast until they leaven the whole lump.'[2] Thus we see how the ins and outs, in constant succession, like the buckets in a dredging machine, discharge the moral filth they accumulate when out, upon the better brought up children, with fatal results. The alarming number of these 'buckets' may be estimated from the number of admissions and discharges, in proportion to the total population of the schools. A Return supplied by Dr. Bridges to the Local Government Board Report for 1873-74, shows that the number of admissions during 1873 was 84 per cent of the total number in the metropolitan schools, and the number of discharges 79 per cent.

There is no reason to hope that this evil diminishes as the years go on. One family returned to St. Pancras Workhouse seventeen times between July 1885 and early in

[1] In the Report of the Committee on the Boarding-out system, appointed by the Bath Board of Guardians in 1869, and signed by Colonel Grant (chairman) and his fellow-workers, we find the following:—'Your committees are informed that in the Highworth and Swindon Union, of which D. Archer, Esq., is chairman, on the 29th ult., there being a fair in the neighbourhood, 39 persons had taken their discharge, all of either idle or bad character, among whom were 26 children; and that had the weather been fine 21 more would have gone, of whom 14 were children, and of these 14, 11 illegitimate. All these paupers, with the exception of one family, had returned to the workhouse by Saturday, in time for their Sunday dinner; as they had no money on leaving, *how* they must have been living during these five or six days may be easily imagined.'

[2] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1874-75.

December 1886; while another was actually admitted twenty-four times from early in May to early in December 1886; both no doubt remaining in their comfortable quarters to enjoy Christmas fare, including beer. These families were of the most degraded type, and shocking must have been the experiences the miserable children poured forth on their little companions at school.

Still more recent examples are adduced by the Hon. Sydney Holland, who has given a detailed Return of the admissions and discharges at the Workhouse of St. George's, Hanover Square, of two families. One was admitted twenty-nine times between October 1885 and March 1887 inclusive, and the other sixty-two times, between March 1884 and June 1888.[1] Every member did not leave every time, but the children went in and out at least half as often as the father; the mother in the latter instance died soon after the first admission.

There are certain wretched children—a constant anxiety to superintendents and teachers—whose antecedents are too revolting to describe. They have to be incessantly watched, as they are in the habit of drawing little knots of children round them in some quiet corner of the playground and relating their shameful experiences. It is easy to understand the attraction the stories they have to narrate possess for their companions within the monotonous schoolwalls, and how the poison must spread like scab among a flock of sheep. Some schools are partially at least protected from this terrible infection, as we have seen Limehouse was, but the instances are very few. Outcry wide and deep would be raised if children suffering from loathsome infectious physical diseases—smallpox for example—were habitually placed among the ordinary pupils of a crowded school, yet we expose thousands to the risk of still worse contamination without alarm or shame.

Some of the permanent children, though coming from bad surroundings, pass under State guardianship too young to have been deeply contaminated, while there are others

[1] Appendix L to *Report from the Committee on Poor Law Relief*, [*H. L.*], 1888.

who are the offspring of respectable parents, and pure of all but the faults common to childhood, and quickly responsive to kindness. None should be forced into such companionship as may awaken the dormant tendencies to vice or fill their minds and mouths with vile thoughts and words. Yet this is done so long as the ins and outs are placed among them. What these may be, especially in a big school which receives its population from London or other large towns, we have already described. Even the advocates of the schools do not deny the shocking behaviour of these children, alleging that if the permanents were removed the school would become a 'little hell on earth,'—a statement however which we do not endorse. That the children who are already drilled and disciplined help to bring the wild unruly newcomers more quickly into order, and that no master or mistress single-handed could alone manage large numbers of them may be true. But the argument is at least as strong on the other side, viz. that the orderly movements are only outward conformity and involuntary imitation, and that these children teach more of evil than they learn of good. Children learn far more by what they see and hear than by what they read, and more from companions of their own age than from their seniors.

But it is not from the ins and outs only, that this terrible danger comes. Among the permanents there are, it is to be feared, individuals so vicious in mind and speech, and, withal, so cruel and tyrannical that their companions dare not resist association with them, or refuse to perform their wicked behests; and the avowals in after years of their victims show how impossible it is, where large numbers are massed together, for the most vigilant of officers to detect what is going on. Mrs. Nassau Senior tells of one child of six years, whose language was so horrible that the matron was obliged to send her as soon as lessons were over to one of the dormitories, to get her away from her companions.

But vigilance both in and out of school, however incessant, will sometimes be evaded, and full indulgence given to natural propensities; and who can estimate the evil these poor, depraved little creatures must work among their com-

panions crowded in the dense mass of a large school? A guardian aptly compared such schools to barrels packed with apples, where the decaying fruit pressed closely against the sound, speedily infected it and spread rottenness through all.

It is indeed sometimes urged that this public school life is just what the middle and higher classes esteem for their sons, as valuable in forming character and fitting the boys for their part in the world. But, as Mrs. Archer years ago pointed out, in spite of seeming resemblance the schools are in no way analogous. Harrow and Rugby are not *homes* as well as schools, and the life there is only one of the many moulding and enlarging influences which surround the boys. It is not even the most important; it is, or should be, subordinate to that of home and family affection. It is broken by long holidays giving ample opportunity for change and enjoyment, and often it is brightened by friendships and amusements. The boys too are soon impressed with the consciousness that their future depends on taking advantage of present opportunities. Moreover, and this is a most important point, if the parents or guardians of a lad have reason to suspect he is learning evil from his companions, they can remove him at once; or if the master has proof that a boy is contaminating the school by vice and evil example he may peremptorily expel him. But for the class we are considering the school is not part of, but all their young life, the early impressions they receive are not modified or corrected by those of home, and the master has no power to dismiss a vicious child, however sure he may be that it is doing infinite mischief. He knows that a very large percentage of the pupils belong to a most degraded class, yet he cannot protest against their admission or even keep them separate. All he can do is to report to the guardians when the case is very flagrant, and request that the culprit may be removed. The guardians, however, must find a refuge for the child before dismissal; they have indeed one remedy in their hands, and this is to bring the offender before a magistrate and have him or her sent to a certified Industrial School as 'refractory.' But they are

very reluctant indeed to take this course. It involves much trouble and is usually considered to imply a reproach to the management of their school; though it would, on the contrary, often be a striking proof of vigilance and insight. An illustrative case lately occurred. The mistress of a large pauper school discovered that one of the elder girls was, when beyond observation of the officers, habitually shameless and disgusting in language—a discovery unfortunately not made until a year after her admission. No punishment had the slightest effect, and at last a lady guardian was appealed to who succeeded in obtaining her transference to a small training home, due notice of her habits being of course given. The matron of this Home had filled the same office at a Lock hospital, and her first report, given soon after the girl's admission, was that in all her experience she had never heard language so foul as this miserable creature used. Another instance occurring at another school may be mentioned, in which the behaviour of the offender, a little boy, was so gross that it was impossible to leave him among other children, and he was put, as the only place in which he could not do harm, in a ward of the workhouse with the old women.

And still another element of danger exists in large pauper schools. A big girl going in may be used by infamous connections outside as a decoy duck, to induce her companions when they depart to resort to the houses where their destruction is certain. A lady who for many years interested herself in behalf of young girls discharged from such a school, had evidence she could not doubt that they had been exposed to this evil influence.

The late Mr. Browne, school inspector to the Local Government Board, says in his report, 1870-71, 'The proper management of pauper girls is the great difficulty under any system.' Certainly no system can succeed which ignores their highest and holiest feelings. It is the most serious blot in the scheme of pauper schools that no account is made of the child's natural desire for home life, for affection, and above all for parental love. Deprived of these, it feels an outcast and is only too likely some day or

other to retaliate on that society which has wronged it. If we take home and love from the poor, we reduce their fate to that of the beasts of burden. The craving for notice and affection so precious to women will assert itself, and if deprived of healthy satisfaction will seek what is injurious. Miss Blanche Pigott relates how a poor girl exclaimed, 'I would rather be noticed for being downright wicked than not be noticed at all.' Perhaps wickedness with her did not bear the same stigma as with others who have never known the scenes of vice with which her class are familiar.

With reference to the physical condition of pauper children, the administrators of the poor law take more minute precautions, and issue more elaborate regulations, than for the prevention of their moral infection; perhaps because the effects of bodily disease are more apparent, and the consequences of neglect make themselves more immediately felt.

A large proportion of the children who come into workhouses are extremely filthy, their heads are infested with vermin, and their skins with disease. If the management is good and the officers are zealous, thorough cleansing may be effected in a few hours; but frequently the hair has to be cut off close to the head to get rid of the vermin, while unfortunately no such ready process can be employed for the cure of the skin. Cleanliness, dieting, and medical treatment may after a time seem to have succeeded; but often the malady quickly re-appears, and the change to the country air of the schools seems to bring it out again. Although the schools were from the first prohibited from admitting children with infectious disease, the great pressure upon workhouse accommodation for some years led, previous to 1873, to the violation of the order. In that year the Local Government Board issued a Circular Letter to the Metropolitan Boards of Guardians calling upon them to take effective precautions against a continuance of the evil.

'It must be obvious to Boards of Guardians,' said the Department, 'that, *when large numbers of children are congregated together, ailments, in themselves comparatively*

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

slight, may, by reason of their infectious nature, act very injuriously on the general health of the school.'[1] (The italics are our own.) The Board urged as 'very important that each child, before he leaves the workhouse for the school, should be subjected to a very careful examination by the medical officer, both as regards general health, and also more especially as regards the condition of the hair and scalp, of the skin, and of the eyes and eyelids. In the event of the child's health not being found to be satisfactory in these respects, he should be retained in the infirmary of the union or parish until he can with safety be removed to the school.'[2] Besides other more minute suggestions, it further recommended quarantine in appropriate wards of at least a fortnight's duration, directed that the medical officer of the school should keep a book describing the state of each child on its admission, and strongly advised that 'the superintending nurse of the probation wards should be a person of superior qualifications, competent not merely to exercise the strictest watchfulness over the health and cleanliness of the children under her care, but also, as far as practicable, to superintend their occupations and amusements during the period of probation.'[3] The latter is a most important provision, of much benefit to the children when carried into effect.

One result of these elaborate instructions can hardly have been anticipated by the Local Government Board. The medical officer at the workhouse certifies the child to have been duly examined for school, and he is accordingly sent thither, perhaps many miles distant. The medical officer at the school detecting possibly some latent symptom, or taking a fresh view of the case, declares him unfit, and returns him to the workhouse, where his lot will frequently be cast in the adult wards of the Infirmary. 'The ailments of children are often long and tedious,' writes Dr. Clutterbuck, Inspector of Workhouse Schools, 'they are subject to many contagious diseases, and in the sick wards they have nothing to do but to listen to the

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1873-74.
[2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*

conversation of the adults, much of which is such as no child should ever hear, and this unfortunately exercises fascinating influence upon them.'[1] We have found in a workhouse infirmary of high reputation children in the same ward with women of the most abandoned character. Of course this should under no circumstances be possible; yet classification according to age, sex, character, and disease (taking into account the varieties of infection) is so complicated and demands such a multiplicity of wards, and in consequence, of officers, that no one acquainted with workhouse conditions will be astonished that so gross a wrong as we have cited should sometimes occur.

After a stay in the workhouse of some weeks, or it may be months, the child may be returned with a clean bill of health to the school, very probably to be again sent back to the infirmary—a process which may be carried on even for years. Meanwhile he passes his time mainly in the corrupting society of the infirmary, and, unless in the rare instances where—as at St. Pancras—a teacher collects the children capable of instruction, escapes schooling altogether.

There is, besides, the quarantine of at least a fortnight enjoined, before the child shall be allowed to mix with the other children of the school. As a further precaution against infection it is directed in some schools that (the children being admitted in batches on a fixed day of the week) new comers shall be kept separate from those who have gone through some portion of their probation—an arrangement demanding, of course, distinct probationary accommodation. Even where the competent superintendent recommended by the Local Government Board is secured for each branch of this dual quarantine, it is plain that little schooling can be accomplished under such constant change.

In spite of all the safeguards we have described there are frequent outbreaks at the schools of ringworm, and other infectious skin diseases, when isolation and prolonged treatment become necessary. Most schools have their

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1874-75.

own infirmary, but sometimes a case must be sent back to the workhouse and placed in its adult sick ward; and thus again we see how children are exposed to the very contamination to guard against which the guardians have at enormous cost built schools remote from the workhouse. One Metropolitan Board has, we learn, resolved not thus to stultify itself where infection is not apprehended. The sickly children from Holborn Union are now sent to the school infirmary at Mitcham.

The maladies to which pauper children are peculiarly liable are trying and tedious in character, but the worst scourge of all is ophthalmia. Evidently the germs of this disabling disease find their most congenial soil in our large pauper schools. The special and elaborate report of Mr. Nettleship, the eminent oculist who, in 1874, by the desire of the Local Government Board, examined the children, then numbering 8,798, of the metropolitan pauper schools, is painfully interesting, and full of valuable information.

The numbers afflicted in each school vary greatly, as does the character of the disease, and these differences, and the causes, are stated with the utmost detail and clearness, the whole occupying more than a hundred pages in the *Local Government Board Report* of 1874-75. Our space will enable us to touch only upon leading facts. Taking all the children of these schools together, Mr. Nettleship found that the orphans and deserted—those, namely, entirely under the care of guardians—were suffering from disease of a more persistent character than those who had parents. Of the whole population of the schools only 20 per cent had healthy eyelids. Of the remaining 80 per cent, 35 per cent were predisposed to ophthalmia; many having already suffered from one or more attacks, but to whom no vital injury was yet done. Active ophthalmia was present in 15 per cent, while 30 per cent had bad granular lids without present symptoms; many of these were extremely liable to relapses and to corneal damage. Of the whole number he estimated the sight of 9 per cent was permanently injured, the great majority of

these being cases of long standing; forty-two children had for the present, at least, practically lost the sight of one eye, while two were blind of both. As to how far this ophthalmia was due to school life, Mr. Nettleship made careful inquiries, and he ascertained that—

'1st. The largest proportion of the cases of ophthalmia begin within the first twelve months of residence in the schools. . . . and that the liability to attacks accompanied by discharge [from the eyes] becomes, if anything, a little less after that period.

'2d. The proportion of children who are suffering from ophthalmia [discharge] when admitted for the first time to the schools is far smaller than the percentage with this disease amongst those who have been some time in the schools.

'3rd. Nearly 3 per cent of all the new admissions (those who have been a month or less in the school) have ophthalmia. . . . These figures tell exactly the same tale in general terms, viz. that the risk of getting ophthalmia is very far greater in the metropolitan pauper schools than outside them.' Indeed Mr. Nettleship's report shows that ophthalmia fastens more firmly on the children brought up in these schools in fine country air, fairly fed, and with all appliances for cleanliness, than on those of our dirty crowded courts, who live under the unhealthy conditions of poor town life, but who nevertheless have a spring of vitality and often too a brightness rarely indeed to be seen in the children of our large institutions.' The constant running in and out of doors, incidental to child life in very humble homes, is considered to be hostile to ophthalmia, we suppose as indicating freedom from irksome restraint as well as frequent breathing of the open air. It is inevitably absent from the big schools, as such movements of many hundreds of children would send order, and even the possibility of control, to the winds. But as applying only to one department, that of the infants, to whom such variety is doubtless more important than to elder children, it is practically very difficult to give this refreshment, even with the frequent change of occupation proper to their age. Unless their

rooms open on to the garden or play-yard they can only reach them by long passages, and the time and fatigue of marching columns of these little ones, whose pace must be governed by that of the weakest, makes it impossible thus to utilise an interval of five minutes, and certainly deters teachers from so occupying much longer spaces between lessons. In fact in every direction except where, for facilitating instruction, the enthusiasm of numbers is of use, the aggregation of these little human beings assumes the form of evil, blocking the way to that wholesome simplicity of daily life in which are found the surest preventatives of disease, whether moral or physical.

'By far the larger share of ophthalmia in the schools,' we return to Mr. Nettleship's report, 'both as to number of cases, and as to obstinacy and serious results, is certainly due to school life. . . . Life in the schools, therefore, has the effect of transferring to the badly granular state a large number of children whose eyes were, on admission, either quite healthy or only predisposed to ophthalmia.' Again, 'A large number, probably the larger proportion of the children who are brought to the school in this state, have been in them before, and got the eye disease while there.' And yet precautions elaborate and costly in the extreme are taken to secure the perfect cleanliness which is necessary in artificial conditions of life, to prevent the spread of the disease.

At Hanwell after a fearful visitation, a supply of clean towels was made daily and averaged 2000, an arrangement which has become common in large pauper schools; while at one, Forest Gate, where nearly a third of the children are now (1888) suffering from ophthalmia, each child has two towels a day. Mr. Nettleship remarks of Hanwell that its present system [1874] may be shortly described as 'an arrangement for favouring the production and spread of the disease and then keeping it in check by unceasing laborious and expensive medical treatment.' How far the 'laborious and expensive medical treatment' has succeeded at Hanwell may be judged from the following information, which appeared in the *Times* of Oct. 31st, 1888:—'An

inspection has just been made of the Central London District Poor Law Schools at Hanwell, with a view to ascertain what remedy could be found for the present serious state of affairs arising from the contagion of ophthalmia among the children. Dr. Bridges, the medical inspector of the Local Government Board, and Mr. Smith, the architect, have issued their report, which was read at the meeting of the managers of the schools on Monday. From this report it appears that out of 2649 distinct cases of ophthalmia at the schools during the last thirteen years only 539 could be traced as being imported, the remainder having arisen from contagion within the school buildings; and that although iron huts had been erected and a comparative separation of ophthalmic cases effected in 1875, the above figures showed that the results had not been successful. . . . Dr. Bridges now proposes that the managers of the Hanwell Schools should provide separate buildings for the treatment of ophthalmia, or that a separate establishment should be erected for infants, and that under any circumstances three large attic rooms at Hanwell Schools containing 300 beds should at once be abandoned as dormitories. The main building, Dr. Bridges suggests, should be recast into three portions—a centre block for administrative purposes, and two wings adapted for boys and girls respectively.'

The managers would appear to be still struggling with their terrible task, as in the *Metropolitan*, of the following December 8th, an application appears from them to the Metropolitan Asylums Board, for any vacant building they would let temporarily for the accommodation of about 300 children suffering from ophthalmia. The application was refused chiefly on the ground that when ophthalmia gains footing in a building it is very difficult to eradicate the contagion, and one lent for these children might be rendered dangerous for use by others.

In many of these institutions the precaution is taken to arrange the washing taps on the jet system, to prevent any two children by any chance using the same water; and in one if not more schools a similar method, by the aid of

a very complicated arrangement of pipes, is adopted in the baths.

But Mr. Nettleship is of opinion that the spread of the disease is more due to personal contagion, overcrowding, want of fresh air, and liberty, than to defective or insufficient sanitary arrangements. 'I do not believe that under ordinary circumstances discharging ophthalmia can *become and remain for months* prevalent among a body of persons unless facilities for contagion exist.' Obviously among so great a number massed together in the big schools there must be constant contact with the disease conveying it to children not previously affected. We have, however, been told by the medical officer of a large school that such contact is not infrequently wilful. If the affected children like life in the infirmary better than in the school, they know how to bring on or renew an attack which is passing away, and thus make longer detention in the eye ward necessary.

Mr. Nettleship's Report, it must be understood, so far as we have quoted, is upon *the average state of the schools* when he visited them. It does not include the serious outbreaks which sometimes take place, especially after an epidemic of measles, and do great mischief. There had been such an outbreak at Sutton beginning the end of September 1873, the disease breaking out again and again for some time afterwards. In this visitation there were 101 cases of purulent ophthalmia between the end of September 1873 and the middle of August of the following year. In eleven of these cases there was the loss of one eye. Two of the nurses in the ophthalmic ward each lost an eye from the disease. At Leytonstone a severe outbreak took place between October and December 1869, five children each losing one eye. At Anerley there was a severe epidemic 1862-63, and this school, now singularly free from the disease,[1] was for a long time greatly troubled with it.

[1] Dr. Bridges, in support of the opinion of the Medical Staff of the Local Government Board, that ophthalmia is not 'a necessary evil in poor law schools' cited Anerley 'where by the adoption of a complete system of separation and special attention to this particular disease, it was practically stamped out, there being between the years 1877-1881 not more than

Early in 1862 a destructive outbreak occurred at Hanwell very similar to that at Sutton, when about seven eyes were lost, two children losing both eyes. 'Ashford, the newest of the schools, has been open only just two years [1874]. Its construction is better than that of any other school, and it contains just half its full number of children. One fifth of all its inmates had discharge [ophthalmic], the vast majority of these being infants, of whom 50 per cent showed this symptom. There were, however, no severe cases.'[1]

Notwithstanding its better construction, Ashford was visited in 1885 by an outbreak of typhoid fever which struck down nearly 300 of the 660 children then in the school, and caused several deaths, not only among the children but also in the staff. The shallow well, it was found, from which the drinking water came, had become contaminated by sewage, and the outbreak was at once stopped when a supply of pure water was obtained.[2] Here indeed is a startling instance of the fatal result of massing great numbers together, yet how little attention has it attracted! Let us imagine a village whose inhabitants equalled those of Ashford School, having nearly half its population 'down with fever' and several deaths among the victims. Would it not be a topic for every newspaper, and the progress and terrible effects of the visitation excite wide interest and sympathy? Is it that we forget the very existence of these hundreds of helpless children put away from sight in the big schools, or have we come to regard it as inevitable if disease enters there that it will run riot?

Mr. Nettleship's remark is very significant, 'That as regards ophthalmia, judged by the state of the eyelids, the *orphan* and *deserted* children *are worse* than those who have parents,'[3]—a convincing proof that this terrible disease must

five cases under treatment, and that although subsequently to the appointment of a new medical officer in 1884 the number of cases increased to twenty, yet by carefully carrying out the arrangements made in 1887 the school had since returned to the high standard of the years 1877, 1881—in fact, there were no cases of ophthalmia at Anerley at the present time.' *Metropolitan*, Nov. 3d, 1888.

[1] Mr. Nettleship, *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1874-75.
[2] Mr. Holgate, *Ibid.* 1885-86. [3] *Ibid.* 1874-75.

be largely due to school conditions, as these are the children who do not quit the schools from year's end to year's end, being supposed, moreover, to derive great advantage from their unbroken residence.

Mr. Nettleship suggests various remedies by which ophthalmia might, he thinks, be greatly lessened if not extirpated, but which would (as he himself points out) also add greatly to the cost of these already too costly establishments. He says: 'Of course no pauper school can be in a permanently and safely good ophthalmic state, unless the superintendence is good, and I have a very definite opinion that, however good the chief officer may be, the chief office will not be done uniformly and permanently well if the institution is too large to allow of the superintendent having a personal knowledge, not only of the chief details of the various departments, but of the children individually, at least of all the boys and girls.'[1]

It is noteworthy that both Mr. Nettleship and Mrs. Nassau Senior, officially inspecting these schools, quite independently and with different aims, received the same impression of their deadening effect on the moral, mental, and physical development of the scholars. Both recommend, in direct opposition to the then growing tendency to combine unions and enlarge the schools, that the large schools should be practically broken up into smaller ones that the children might have more chance of individual treatment; that their lives should be more natural and less machine-like, and their play be made more interesting to them. On this point Mr. H. D. Courtney (sub-school-inspector for the metropolitan district) says: 'It may seem an extraordinary thing to those not used to our pauper schools, that it should be necessary to make any remarks on the subject of play; but from my experience of these schools during a period of five years, I may say that I have been struck with the great want of energy often displayed by the various children in the various playgrounds. . . . I think that more encouragement should be given to the children to engage in active play, and nothing will do more

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1874-75.

to promote this end than those who are set over them joining heartily in the games when practicable. In fact it is not too much to say, that the children often want to be taught to play as much as to work.'[1]

Mr. Nettleship's report on ophthalmia had been preceded by two by Dr. Bridges and Dr. Mowatt respectively.[2] The former says, 'From this chronic type of disease [ophthalmia] I have never yet found any pauper school absolutely free.' Again, quoting a report of the late Mr. Critchett, 'Thus we find a disease which is mild and easily controlled when it occurs in a single individual, or even in a family, becomes intractable and unmanageable when it invades a large school.' Both these authorities agree in the necessity for the best sanitary arrangements, space, air, etc. Dr. Bridges says, and his words have special weight as coming from a medical inspector of long experience—'The reason for which I give prominence to what I may perhaps describe as the non-natural distribution of children over the school area, is to make it clear at starting that hygienic precautions which are wholly unnecessary for children mixing in groups of three or four with adult persons of wholly different constitutional tendency from their own (that is to say, for families as nature formed them, either in primitive villages, aristocratic squares, or crowded cities), do become necessary when large numbers of children, all with similar constitutional liability to juvenile disease, are brought together.'

Dr. Mowatt remarks: 'It may be said that separate schoolrooms, properly lighted, warmed, and ventilated, and furnished with fit desks, seats, and other apparatus, are luxuries, and as such not adapted for pauper schools.

'I dissent entirely from this doctrine. For no children are they more necessary than for those born and bred in poverty, misery, and their surroundings, if the intention of placing them in these schools be to make strong, healthy men and women of them.'

In all the three reports there are the same recommendations as to increased space, both in the interior of the

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1873-74. [2] *Ibid.*

school, and outside for play-grounds, for increased individual watchfulness, supervision, greater variety of food, excessive cleanliness, especially with bed linen and towels, which should not only be washed, we are told, but disinfected as well. The improvements suggested have not been, and perhaps could not be, carried into effect in their integrity; yet most of the metropolitan Boards of Guardians have endeavoured to modify the unfavourable conditions of their schools. Success in bringing this to pass must depend to a large extent on the intelligence and readiness of their officers to co-operate with them. The recommendation to allow the children to take their exercise in the open grounds attached to most schools, instead of in the enclosed play-yards, has been urged over and over and over again, by the school and medical inspectors; and no moderately intelligent or kind-hearted guardian could doubt the desirableness of complying. But unless the chief officers share their conviction and are willing to incur the extra trouble compliance entails, nothing less than the managing committee, or at least a very energetic and determined member of it, residing at the school, would bring even so important and obvious an improvement about. And more or less the same may be said of every alteration in the hum-drum routine of these institutions. Where, however, guardians and officers alike desire the welfare of the children, reforms are achieved. For three or four years past, the boys at Mitcham who have good-conduct marks, have been allowed to go beyond the school premises at suitable times without an officer. No abuse, we believe, of this privilege has occurred, and running away, which used to be common, has ceased. Similar leave is granted with good effect at Leavesden.

Another improvement has been made at Mitcham by the purchase of a gentleman's house adjacent to the original school buildings, in which are lodged the boys between seven and ten years of age. This divides the mass, and is an important advantage, too, where the numbers are very large, in protecting the smaller boys from the tyrants and bullies, of whom some unhappily are pretty sure to be found

among their elder companions. This house, when being adapted for its present purpose, was painted throughout—in place of the ordinary lime-washing—and the floors were varnished. Facility in keeping the walls clean and absence of dust were thus secured, and affections of the eye and skin got rid of for a time certainly, perhaps permanently. The uniform of the girls has been made more becoming and unpauper-like; and, extending improvement to the staff arrangements, some of the teachers are allowed to reside outside the school (as is the case at Sutton) with much benefit from the break in the monotony of institution life.

The general improvement perceptible throughout the country is very distinct both at Swinton and Kirkdale. Triennial returns upon the boys and girls placed out from the latter school between 1870 and 1886 show a marked increase in the proportion known to do well, together with a very great diminution in the numbers lost sight of. A large decrease of children at Kirkdale has taken place during the period, namely from 1500 in 1870 to 566 in 1888. Recent results in regard to boys from Swinton are very remarkable. A return upon 496 sent out to situations in 1886-7-8, classes all as 'very satisfactory' or 'satisfactory,' except three who are 'unsatisfactory.' Not one has been lost sight of. This is high testimony to the enlightened management of the late superintendent, Mr. Sutton, recently removed by sudden death. He had his heart in his work, and introduced many improvements. Much attention was given to vocal music, the children singing in the church choir, and taking part in concerts and other performances which enlivened the winter. These were given alternately, the officers and the children being in turn the entertainers. To the care taken under his direction in selecting employers for those passing out into the world, and the rules laid down to secure the performance of the duties undertaken on both sides, the steady conduct of the boys is probably in great part due. The return does not show like success among the 354 girls placed out during the same period. The proportion known to be 'very

satisfactory' or 'satisfactory' is less than three-quarters of the whole number; 29 have returned to the workhouse, but some of them from sickness; and a larger number have been lost sight of. We do not learn that in the organisation of the school there are any circumstances to account for the difference of outcome between boys and girls. The explanation may perhaps be partly found in the number of children there which, at a time when many of these girls must have been its inmates, was probably not much below a thousand. There has been of late years a steady decrease, which we trust will continue. The latest return gives the number at 718.[1]

With reference especially to ophthalmia, the reports we have quoted have so far caused amelioration in the conditions of the metropolitan schools, that one (Anerley), if not more, seems to be freed from the curse, and severe outbreaks have been lessened. The disease, however, still hangs about many schools, causing at any rate much present suffering, by treatment as well as disease, with the risk of permanently impaired eyesight, and is a source of constant anxiety and expense to prevent its increasing both in intensity and area.

Leavesden, Forest Gate, and Norwood—all, we believe, ranking high in point of management—are instances of recent visitations of the disease more or less severe, while Hanwell is at the present time terribly afflicted. The malady, too, proves more difficult to eradicate than when it attacks large schools for children of another class.

That guardians themselves are in many places growing more and more doubtful of the advantage of these barrack-like schools is shown by the increasing disposition to break them up into blocks; or, where new schools are planned, to adopt the Cottage Homes system. Division into blocks is exemplified at the South Metropolitan Schools at Sutton, which receives children from some of the poorest and worst parts of London. It is by far the largest of the district schools, having had during the year ending Lady Day 1887 an average population of 1820, making, with the

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1887-88.

children at Witham and at Herne Bay Infirmary, a total of 2169 belonging to the South Metropolitan District.[1] The girls' school has lately been thus broken up into four or five blocks. A lady supervises the whole as matron. Each block accommodates one hundred girls under the charge of a housekeeper and three assistants; formerly there were housemaids, but these have been removed as the girls have grown more helpful. Like a fashionable flat, each block is self contained, having its own domestic offices, including a laundry. Half timers, called working girls, do the domestic work under the direction of the housekeeper; but this officer has lately been dispensed with in some of the houses, and the increased responsibility thrown upon the girls is found to have a useful effect. An attempt was made also to utilise these working girls for the infant department, which is still in the main building; but this had to be given up as, among other difficulties, it interfered with school attendance.

The matron has done much to brighten the monotonous lives of her wards; great attention is paid to personal neatness, and when a girl leaves for a situation she is encouraged to make as much of her outfit as possible herself, and allowed individual choice in the articles. This is very good, and might be further improved by acting upon a suggestion of Mr. Holgate's. At Forest Gate, he reports, the girls, before quitting the school, are admitted in succession to a small class for special training in housework, which occupies a cottage in the school-ground. They are sent daily to the neighbouring shops to buy the food they are to cook, the price and quantity being entered by each in her memorandum book. Where remoteness from shops makes this impracticable, Mr. Holgate proposes that the school stores might be treated as a shop, and the girls obtain there in the same methodical manner not only the provisions they need, but materials for the outfit they require on going to service.[2]

[1] *Statement of Accounts and Statistics of the Board of Managers.* Boot, 38 Gracechurch Street, 1887.

[2] *Report of the Local Government Board,* 1886-87.

Besides the four dormitories in each block at Sutton, there is a small sleeping-room, and to this the girls about to leave for service are promoted. Here they have a share of a chest of drawers to keep their own things in, and so are gradually prepared for the change from a communistic mode of living to that of ordinary human beings, with natural instincts of possession and individual carefulness. They are also taught higher domestic duties by being allowed to attend upon the staff.[1]

Sutton school is situate in fine air, close to the Banstead Downs; the children look healthy, and there is very little illness, though there are cases of ophthalmia, imported probably by the ins and outs. Of these it contains an unusual proportion, as most of the permanent children are sent to school at Witham in Essex; a peculiar arrangement considering the stress generally laid by guardians on the value of retaining these children to influence the temporary ones. The rigid conditions of the poor law and the numbers to be dealt with weigh at Sutton, as elsewhere, against change or individual treatment; although much endeavour is being made to neutralise the evil effect of the great numbers. The infants, for instance, form a distinct department with a matron of their own, who encourages activity and childish games.

Thirty-three officers are attached to the branch, the school for elder boys has fifty-five, that for smaller boys, forty-eight; the infirmary and probationary wards, together, twenty-two, and the girls' school, before the recent reduction we have mentioned, had fifty-two; making a grand total, with a clerk for the general establishment, of two hundred and eleven. The infirmary at Herne Bay and the school at Witham have staffs numbering respectively thirty and twenty-eight. The weekly cost per head for boys and infants at Sutton is just under 9s., but for girls it is about 12s. 6d.; at Witham it is a little over 8s., and at Herne Bay nearly 11s. These amounts include loans and interest.

Only about two miles from the school at Sutton, just across the Banstead Downs, is that for the Kensington and

[1] This plan is also pursued at others of the large schools.

Chelsea unions, built on the Cottage Home plan, where the block system is far more completely carried into effect. Instead of one vast building, or three or four large houses, a short road is seen bordered on either side with small detached dwellings. About half-way down this road is a little church, a staff house for the teachers, the school, and a very pretty residence with garden for the master and matron, forming the division between the boys' and girls' departments. Two cottages are used as infirmaries, one for infectious, the other for ordinary cases, so there is never need to return sick children to the workhouse. In bad cases of infectious skin disease, as ringworm, the cottage in which it has appeared is sometimes 'closed,' *i.e.* its inmates are isolated from the rest of the children and restricted to their own premises till free from the disease, but this interferes with school attendances. The boys' cottages are each in charge of a Father and Mother; the former is engaged in some trade or daily labour outside the institution, the latter has to attend exclusively to her large family; the cottages, originally intended, we believe, to receive 34 or 36 children, now contain even 38, and in a very bad winter perhaps one or two more.

The girls' homes, with from 24 to 26 beds, are under the charge of a Mother only. She is helped in her work by her numerous daughters, to whom she teaches washing, simple cooking, etc. In this way the employment of servants is got rid of. In the dormitories there is a neat little basket for each girl to place her folded clothes in, Mrs. Nassau Senior's hint of the objection to keeping these in the sleeping-rooms being apparently ignored; however, the dormitories are elaborately ventilated, and no smell was perceptible to us. Each child has a numbered portion of a shelf for her towel, brush, and comb. The sanitary arrangements are excellent, and as much freedom as possible under poor law regulations is allowed the Mothers with reference to the food, with advantage both to the children's health and to economy.

There have been no outbreaks of ophthalmia since the opening of the schools in 1880. The jet system of washing

is adopted, though, as one Mother ruefully remarked, looking at the thin line of water spurting from the tap, 'the boys never do get a good swill at that.' They have, however, baths in all the cottages, and a large swimming bath for boys (none for girls unhappily), and the children certainly all looked remarkably clean.[1]

The great difficulty formerly felt at Banstead, as at all these schools, is the mischief, moral and physical, wrought by the ins and outs. To guard against this a probationary school has been established for the Kensington and Chelsea district at Hammersmith, where the children are kept till there is no danger of physical infection. Many never reach Banstead, being discharged with their parents before the probationary period is over; and so far the double risk is obviated. Still a good many do reach Banstead, and when their short sojourn there ends often part from their house parents with tears and regret. Both at Sutton and Banstead we are told that the characters of the housekeeper or Mother exert a perceptible and even marked influence on the children in her charge. In both cases, under the present superintendence[2] we should find it difficult to believe in the possibility of cruelty or ill-usage without immediate detection, but some of the officers showed a devotion and personal fervour for their work lacking in others.

Nothing is spared to make a good and happy child of the little pauper; the chief supervision is of the very highest order, and the influence of this was apparent throughout the staff. The little colony is in the purest air and surrounded by beautiful country. Order, good organisation, and cleanliness are everywhere to be seen. But also everywhere was the faint but unmistakable impression of an artificial system; everywhere was the stamp of the poor law, the mark of the pauper. The Cottage Homes and their families were much too large for reality; their studied neatness and affected homeliness did not give the *feeling* of home, for its genuine conditions were wanting.

[1] There are swimming baths for girls at some of the schools, as Leavesden, Forest Gate, and Anerley, more or less used according to the efforts of guardians and officers.

[2] July 1887.

Each little one brought up in them is but one among very many, the home is after all but an imitation, and the child who leaves it has no right ever to return, either to find sympathy or to renew early affections and memories. The comparison to chickens reared in an incubator instead of running freely in a farm-yard forces itself on the beholder, and brings with it the question, Why such elaborate trouble and expenditure, when for many of the children real homes might be found, at so much less cost? Why, too, should the children wear the pauper uniform and be marked out as a distinct class, when so very much on the other hand is being done to eradicate the pauper taint and break off all connection with the workhouse and its associations?

But even if such schools were more successful than they are, their excessive cost would, and should, always be a heavy drawback—a cost which shows a constant tendency to increase, and felt to be all the more exacting in times like the present, when every one is anxiously considering his own personal expenditure. This is a fact that ratepayers do not realise; indeed they seem strangely indifferent to the vast sums spent on these pauper palaces. On examining into this expenditure we find that poverty, ignorance, and crime are the most costly and wasteful items in our national expenditure.

These reflections apply with more or less aptness to other schools arranged on the same plan, although there is variety in their main features. The Marston Green Cottage Homes are probably the best known after Banstead, and have been planned with equal care. They were opened nine years ago, and are an object of incessant interest to the School Committee. But, with many excellences, they afford a striking example of a defect inherent in pauper schools. Unlike Banstead, however, protected to a certain extent as it is from the ins and outs by the admirable but excessively costly school at Hammersmith, the casual class at Marston Green amounts to upwards of 40 per cent of the whole population.[1] It is evident that the constant

[1] *Annual Reports of the Marston Green Cottage Homes, Birmingham.*

change in each group thus caused must vitally injure its family character, farther impaired by the Cottage fathers and mothers having their private sitting-rooms, even taking some meals apart from the children. In case of illness, and the child's removal to the infirmary, its return to its own Cottage is by no means certain. Its place may have been filled up by a new-comer, and one will be found for it elsewhere. All this may be unavoidable, but it leaves a very faint likeness to the true home wherein persons of varying age and consequently of varying influences over each other dwell together and remain in close relationship, with few exceptions, until its younger members go out into the world. The character of each, even of the most insignificant member, materially affects the comfort and sometimes even the prosperity of the whole family. As they enjoy so must they suffer together, and thus by the beautiful law of Nature is woven an indissoluble bond of love, pity, and forbearance which never can arise among the heterogeneous occupants of the Cottage Home who have no tie to each other in the past and rarely in the future.

Again, when the boy or girl has started in life, although it may on a holiday revisit its Cottage 'parents' and have the support and comfort of correspondence with it, this, it must be remembered, still links them to pauperism; while, should the child need the shelter of its home in after life, it can obtain it only through the pauper's gate. To be readmitted it must sink back to that miserable status to raise it from which has been the end and aim of its costly training. And if past sixteen the school is for ever closed to it.

Cottage Homes were suggested by the late Mr. Doyle, Poor law inspector, who recommended, however, that the number in each family should be limited to twelve—six boys and six girls, thus also proposing the association of the sexes.[1]

The scheme set forth by Mr. Doyle was adopted by the

[1] *A Letter addressed to J. T. Llewelyn, Esq., Chairman of the Board of Guardians of Swansea Union*, by Andrew Doyle, 1873. It contains, besides valuable information concerning Mettray and several other foreign institutions managed on the family principle, a full and very interesting account of Quatt school, which we have briefly described at p. 52.

Swansea guardians in the school they established, in 1878, at Bridgend, Glamorganshire. Each of the six cottages is built for twelve children; and we believe we are correct in saying that this is the only pauper school where boys and girls are in association, five of one and seven of the other sex being placed in each Home. Thus brothers and sisters need not be separated. All the children are half-timers, the boys working on the land (eight acres) belonging to the school, the girls in the Homes under the matrons. In the ten years of its existence the school has proved very successful. Before it was opened great difficulty was experienced in finding first situations for the children from the workhouse; now the demand exceeds the supply, as the children are well trained. Their after-careers are said to be very satisfactory. The total number is small, as only six cottages are found necessary.

Cottage Homes are undoubtedly in many ways a distinct improvement on the barrack school with its various departments all under one roof, living, and too often sleeping rooms opening into long, dreary passages, impossible to ventilate thoroughly,—cold in winter, close in summer, and often smelling disagreeably all the year round—its enormous dormitories,[1] and their seemingly innumerable beds. Still, after all, the Cottage Homes, despite their name, are pauper schools; their staff and scholars are under poor law regulations, and they form distinct pauper communities, having little contact with the outside world except through officials.

The Sheffield guardians have under consideration a scheme of 'Isolated Homes,' for dealing with the ins and outs, which seems to us admirable. It would entirely prevent their association with the permanents, and by making a school unnecessary, would remove the obstacle which its existence too often presents to boarding-out the children who are eligible, and sending to certified homes those above boarding-out age. The separation which the

[1] We know at this moment a man, formerly an officer in a large workhouse, who attributes his permanent ill health to the foul air and cold draughts of its long corridors and passages.

Sheffield plan would secure was aimed at many years ago in a proposal by Mrs. Archer to send all other than the ins and outs out of the workhouse, some to boarding-out, some to certified schools, and the rest to attend the national school. It provided for the schooling only of the temporary children within the workhouse, putting both boys and girls in charge of a governess, and keeping them entirely cut off from association with those attending school outside, when these are within the workhouse walls out of school hours. But schemes almost identical with that of the Sheffield Board have floated in the mind of many a guardian, anxious to break up masses of children, and protect the better from the evil influence of the worse; though the incubus of the great schools or some other obstacle has proved fatal to their wishes. The Isolated Homes would in some respects resemble Cottage Homes, though simpler and less expensive; but they would be a great improvement upon the latter, in so far that they would not congregate but disperse the children, and would get rid, it may be hoped, of the usual characteristics of a pauper institution.

The proposal is to rent or purchase a suitable house in different parts of the town or suburbs as occasion arises, and draft into it a small group of children, who might be selected according to age and character, so as to reduce to a minimum the evils of association. Each house would be under the care of a married couple, and the arrangements as nearly as possible those of a respectable working man's home; no uniform would be worn, and the children would attend the elementary schools in their neighbourhood.

One house might, if so wanted, be reserved for permanent children, whom it was absolutely impracticable to dispose of by boarding-out, or placing in a certified home, and who form a very small residuum of the whole.

In Scotland, as will be seen in a later chapter, it is usual to board out children likely to remain on the rates more than a few months. There are difficulties, certainly at present insuperable, to following this course in England; and we hail the proposal of the Sheffield guardians as affording,

as nearly as possible, the advantages of boarding-out to the temporary children, and eventually greatly reducing their cost to the parish.

Lord Cranbrook (ex-president of the Local Government Board) stated in his opening address at the Boarding-out Conference, held in the Jerusalem Chamber in July 1885, that an instance had occurred in which children trained on the barrack system cost as much as £86 per head.[1] Of course this was an extreme case, probably caused by a large school being scantily occupied, so that the interest of the capital spent in building, staff expenses, rates and taxes, would be divided only among a few children. But the mere fact of such a thing being possible ought to serve as a danger beacon. The cost to Paddington, however, for its children at Ashford schools makes an approach to this sum.

Returns from 1869 to 1888, showing the amounts charged to this parish in behalf of the West London School District to which it belongs, give the expense per head of the Paddington children in 1888 at £59 : 13 : 6½; but in 1886 it amounted to £62 : 0 : 3½. Of this total the portion per head for 'maintenance, outfits, etc.' was in 1888 only £13 : 14 : 1½, and in 1886 £15 : 4 : 7½, the whole of the remainder being for 'loans' and 'salaries and other expenses.' The item 'maintenance, etc.' is paid directly by the parish in accordance with the number of children sent; but the 'loans' and 'salaries and other expenses' are defrayed from a common fund levied upon each parish forming the district according to its rateable value, and must be paid whether children are sent or not. Paddington's contribution to this common fund amounted in 1887 to £3514 : 3 : 9. Of late years this parish has greatly decreased its contingent of children, and their share per head of the common fund has of course proportionately increased. Hence the present heavy charge for each. But even in the two years when Paddington sent its largest number of children, and this charge was therefore at its

[1] *Report of the Conference*, edited by Blanche A. F. Pigott. Bale & Sons, Great Titchfield Street, London.

lowest, the total cost per head was nearly £31. This may be taken probably as a rough estimate of cost at the other metropolitan pauper schools, as the latest published return for all gives the average as £23 : 9 : 1,[1] deducting 'loans,' the amount for which for Paddington was, when at its lowest, about £7 : 0 : 0. This return gives us the annual cost of a child at the Strand Union School, £18 : 10 : 4; while on the *Exmouth* it is £35 : 5 : 9, and at the West London District £33 : 2 : 2. The Bethnal Green children cost £18 : 15 : 10, much more we fear than can be spent on the non-pauper children of the working class in the same district. The above amounts are exclusive of loans, and with deduction of profit-recoupments, but the last is a very small item.

It is customary to plead that lavish expenditure in the education of children may be truest economy in the end. But this is a very specious doctrine, and might easily lead to the most extravagant schemes being started by guardians 'with views.' Some indeed do boast with airy and irresponsible munificence that everything that money can do is done for their children. Moreover, even money cannot do everything, while increase of taxation should be watched with jealousy. The actual rate may seem small, but it presses heavily on the classes least able to afford it. It spares the extremes; the very rich hardly feel it, the very poor escape it. But it is a terrible weigh-back upon those struggling to keep out of pauperism, seriously cramps the class next above them, and greatly increases the burden of the professional man or trader, forced to live in a particular quarter for his work's sake, and whose rent is not in proportion to income, but is paid from capital employed for bread-winning. If mere expenditure of money could save the poor little friendless children, they certainly cannot complain of niggardly treatment; but no amount of expense will secure good results if the fundamental principles of human nature are ignored, and natural growth and development arrested or thwarted.

[1] *Analysis of the Return of Expenditure during the year ended Lady Day* 1886, *at the Metropolitan Pauper Schools.*

In the provinces the annual cost per child in the pauper schools is nearly as high in proportion as in the Metropolitan district, considering the lower price of land, provisions, etc. There appears, too, to have been somewhat reckless building in certain provincial districts, as we find, in one of Mr. Bowyer's reports, several allusions to large District schools, not half full, leading to expressions of regret that various unions did not combine to remedy such a state of things. Thus the Walsall and West Bromwich School, intended to contain 400 children, was half empty two years after its completion. The total expenditure for building, furniture, and fittings, exclusive of the cost of the land, is stated as £15,900, amounting to £39 : 15s. for each place provided, doubled, of course, so long as the school was only half full.[1] And notwithstanding this great expense, the sanitary state of the school was not satisfactory. Cutaneous and ophthalmic diseases were prevalent, and measures were being taken to remedy this evil, at, of course, additional though absolutely necessary, expense.

Leicester Separate School, also intended for 400, was not half full, but it had been erected at considerably less cost than that at Walsall, viz. £9148. 'The Stoke-upon-Trent School is another instance of an expensive building, which is of much less use than,' says the report, 'it ought to be, owing to the smallness of the number of children at present educated in it. It was constructed for 500 children at a cost, inclusive of chapel, of £14,633; but according to the present sanitary regulations, regarding the proper cubic space per child, I do not believe that it would properly accommodate much more than 400 children. This number, however, is double that which it has hitherto contained, nor is there any greater probability of its ever being filled from the population of the parish than in the cases to which I have previously adverted.'[2]

It may be noted that in two of the schools mentioned, the building of a special chapel on the premises was a costly item, and, as we hold, a grievous mistake. It is extremely difficult to find a suitable clergyman to serve, and

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1873-4. [2] *Ibid.*

indeed when the chapel is built a chaplain is not always appointed. In the house of worship surely the distinction between pauper and non-pauper should be forgotten, where, as in the case of children, no need exists for retaining the worshippers within workhouse walls. We believe it is far better to send them to the parish church, or, if their number be too large for one, let them be divided into parties and attend, under the care of their officers, those conveniently situated. Such an arrangement might be made (as in regard to St. Pancras School we believe it has been, and possibly at others also) a reward for good conduct. If a disfiguring uniform be avoided, the children find themselves, for a few hours at least, on a level with the self-supporting community, and the monotony of school life is broken.

Three expensive and half empty schools all mentioned in one Report assuredly show much blundering in the provision for pauper education, and we do not wonder that parishes shrink from entering school districts, as to do so not only commits them to a fixed plan of education, which might not answer, but also to an annual payment whether they receive a *quid pro quo* or not, as we have shown in analysing the Paddington Returns. Each board of Guardians joining, as in the Metropolis, contracts to pay a certain annual sum for such children as they are entitled to send, and this must be paid whether they send their full complement of children, or a lesser number, or none at all; thus they might have to pay for their maintenance elsewhere, and their contracted cost for accommodation and salaries in the schools as well. In the case, too, of bad outbreaks of epidemics in the school, this double payment would occur according as the Guardians felt it right to remove the affected children to the Workhouse Infirmary, or to withdraw the non-affected from the danger of infection.

In manufacturing districts there is another objection to sinking capital in these large schools. The decay which sometimes occurs in a local industry through stress of competition, alteration of fashion, or other causes, influences pauperism. It may lead at first to such an increase of claimants for aid as apparently to justify the Guardians in

building a large school. But the disturbed conditions in the supply and demand for labour gradually right themselves.

The immigration of workers seeking employment ceases, and the emigration of those thrown out of work begins; and thus the school is left, after a time, without the supply of scholars, which alone would justify its erection. And we must bear in mind, too, that expense thus lavished does not mean commensurate comfort and advantages for the children. On the contrary, it means bigger dormitories, larger dining halls,—in other words, less and less home-like buildings, a more numerous staff, additional mechanical appliances, a more and more artificial existence, multiplying the impediments to individual treatment and development. It means, too, a more complete and reckless mixing up of evil and good elements, and a growing risk of intensifying that dangerous feeling of nonentity and despair which comes of making each child merely an insignificant part of one machine-like body.

Already we have acknowledged gratefully that these schools are a great improvement on the promiscuous mixing together of adult and juvenile paupers. We know, too, that their continued maintenance is still advocated, from the best motives, by many who, however, must suppose that pauper children require treatment different in all respects from that of other children; overlooking the fact that in many cases at least, it is just this different treatment which helps to keep them paupers. But still in this world of mistakes, experiments, and stumbling advance, we plead that even the best motives should not prevent jealous and searching inquiry into a system most costly in its character, most doubtful in its results; especially when that system is continued in circumstances totally different from those under which it was first started. Forty years ago, when district schools were enthusiastically advocated, the educational provision for our humbler classes was lamentably inadequate. There was no school rate; no public schools supplemented those dependent on private generosity; and in many places there were none at all. Where they

did exist they were so frequently crowded that many children were perforce left outside. Their funds were almost always below their needs, and thus they were often so inferior as scarcely to deserve their name. It was well if Guardians of the poor thought education necessary for the children under their charge, and generally the only means of supplying it in those days was to build schools of their own. This necessity no longer exists, and in every way possible our pauper children should be saved from the seclusion of the workhouse.

Exclusiveness is bad in itself for persons of any condition in life. The great harm of monasteries and conventual existence is now fully recognised; but is it sufficiently realised that the mischief they did arose, not from their religious idea, but from their unnatural conditions, and great numbers in one building? We may be laughed at for suggesting that Protestant England is continuing these evils in rate-supported schools, but that this is to some extent the case must be granted. 'I would in any case,' said Mr. William Chambers, 'deprecate the assemblage of large numbers in a single establishment. For orphans, the deaf, the mute, the blind, and the weak in intellect, the nearer we can bring the family principle into operation the better. . . . Of the vices which are apt to grow up among either boys or girls under the monastic system [referring to the Hospital Schools of Edinburgh] I would rather not speak. It is sufficient to say that by no conceivable rules can we enforce the humanising discipline of the paternal home within the sphere of hospital—or call it college—routine. Where the heart is left unsolaced by the holier affections, or is not exhilarated by a sense of freedom and a happy intercourse with the world, it naturally becomes a prey to the baser passions; and much have they to answer for who, from mistaken notions of benevolence, contribute to this course of demoralisation.'[1]

[1] Letter to a friend, March 1858.

CHAPTER IV

STATE AID AND INDIVIDUAL HELP—CERTIFIED AND UNCERTIFIED HOMES—EMIGRATION

'Nothing is more shallow, more barbarously irrational, than to regard the progress of civilisation as the accumulation of restraint'—B. BOSANQUET.

'I have inquired in the proper places, and find a quite passionate demand for women that can sew, such being unattainable just now.'—T. CARLYLE.

BESIDES the systems for pauper children already described, parochial aid has, in recent years, been largely supplemented by individual help, not limited to money assistance, but given also in the more valuable form of personal teaching and guidance, in Homes apart from the Workhouse.

The first of these Homes was founded by Mrs. Way, in 1859, at Brockham in Surrey, on a very small scale, namely, with two girls in a cottage of six rooms. It was soon afterwards certified for the reception of girls of twelve years old and upwards by the Home Office, under the Industrial Schools' Act, to enable Guardians to pay for those they sent to it; but, besides other inconveniences, this gave it in some degree the character of a reformatory institution, which it was desirable to avoid, and was not, indeed, fair to the inmates; and Mrs. Way exerted herself to obtain an Act, under which her own and similar institutions could be certified by the Poor Law Board, and voluntary and parochial aid be thus harmoniously combined. The Certificate implies inspection by the Department granting it, and is thus a guarantee to Guardians that the children they send will be well cared for, while it also legalises their payments to the managers. She accomplished

this in 1862, when the Pauper Education Bill, brought into the House of Commons by the late Lord Iddesleigh, and carried through the Upper House by Lord Devon, became law, and is technically known as 25 and 26 Vict. cap. 43.

The object of Mrs. Way's Home, which, although its foundress has passed away, continues its good work under the direction of Mrs. Lewis A. Way, is to train orphan girls, dependent on parochial relief, to earn their livelihood in respectable service, and she had them prepared to take places as under-maids in large establishments; the households selected for them, as far as possible, being those where there was a mistress who would care for their moral welfare, and a respectable head-servant who would overlook them till able to fill superior places themselves. The demand for good servants is ever increasing, while the supply from various causes diminishes. At one of the annual meetings of the Home, the late Right Hon. Stephen Cave, alluding to this, said he had recently heard of an application from one of the colonies for cooks being forwarded to Cornwall, where servants were generally procured, to which the answer was, 'Cooks! we could as easily send them elephants.'

The training at Brockham thoroughly unpauperises the girls, so much so, that it is not known to their fellow-servants that they were ever dependent on the rates. Some indeed are sent straight to the Home, on the death of their parents, and do not even enter the Workhouse. Of the others, the early reports tell us, when they first arrived, they were characterised by dulness of apprehension, ill-temper, want of self-respect, and negligence as regards the care of property—the usual, and perhaps inevitable, consequences of ordinary pauper life. But these faults yielded to individual treatment, the pleasures and duties of family life, and the genial influence of strong personal attachment to the ladies who devote their time to the institution.

Thirty-eight girls are now received at the Home—non-pauper orphans, who would otherwise have to go to the

Union, being taken for an annual payment of £12, travelling expenses, and outfit. Four shillings a week is paid by the Guardians for the children they send. The girls are much sought after as servants, the wages they obtain being usually £6 for the first year, varying afterwards from £9 to £16. A savings' bank was long since established at the Home, and the girls have deposited a considerable sum.

Some years after the opening of the Home, experience showed the importance of removing the children to it from the workhouse at a much earlier age; and to enable her to do so without altering its character, Mrs. Way established a Nursery Home. Here little children are received from workhouses if Guardians will send them, and, when old enough, are transferred to the Training Home. The work was completed with a department for the reception of ex-pupils (under twenty years of age) when ill, or when out of place unless for serious faults, in which case they are otherwise provided for. To the shelter and good counsel given them Mrs. Way attributed even more importance than to the training at the original Home; the girls using it have only to pay 1s. a week towards their maintenance.

Not long after the Brockham Home began its work, S. Bartholomew's Home was opened at Devizes by Miss Smith. She describes its origin thus: 'A little girl, previously known to me as having been brought up in the workhouse school, one day ran after me in the street, crying out, "Please ma'am, will you send me to the Penitentiary?" I knew that was not the place for her, poor child; she was not a lost one, although in all probability she would soon become, like too many of her fellow-paupers, ruined for want of proper care and protection. To find a safe refuge where she would be kindly treated was the only idea of the poor child. I made inquiries into her story, and ascertained it was true; she had been obliged to leave the wretched situation she was in as maid-of-all-work, from the unkind treatment she had received; she had no clothes but those she had on, which were thread-bare and ragged; she was an orphan, and had no house to turn to, no friend to care for her! This appeal, with the knowledge that there

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

were others in similar circumstances, made me anxious that some effort should be made to aid such helpless ones; and the result was that before long a Home was opened into which this poor girl was received with three others,'—a number since increased. Some are sent from unions, and their cost is partly defrayed by Guardians, and others are placed in the Home by private charity. They are well trained in washing and needlework, etc., are encouraged in every way to become self-supporting, and generally turn out well. Their annual average cost is £14, a fifth of which is defrayed by their earnings.

A training Home was opened in Wolverhampton for pauper girls in 1863, and ten girls were received in it from the workhouse, some being as old as sixteen. The attempt to make any permanent impression on the older girls was, however, found to be hopeless. Violent temper in some cases, confirmed habits of pilfering in others, rendered it impossible to convert them into good servants. The age of admission was therefore lowered, and no children are now received over ten. Good work has been done in this Home, and the right spirit prevails among the girls, as we may judge from the answer of one who had been sent to service: 'Would you not rather be in the Home again' she was asked. 'No,' was the answer; 'the Home has been a good home to me, and I love it dearly, but *now* I am getting my living.' The Home, which is now connected with a Preventive Mission, is well reported on by the Local Government Board Inspector.

The late Mrs. Williamson started a small home for orphan boys and girls many years ago at Leeds, and on her removal to Bath carried her good work with her, opening a Girls' Orphan Home at 2 Macaulay Buildings, and one for orphan boys at Claverton Down. Since her death the management of these has been continued by Miss Judell, who rejoices in having recently enlarged her work and taken a second house for the girls. The Homes are conducted on the family principle, as far as that can be when boys and girls, and consequently brothers and sisters, are separated; and great care is taken to keep expense as

moderate as possible. Thus we find that the total cost of from twelve to fifteen children has not averaged more than £170 per annum, or about £12 per head. 'It is a great mistake to suppose,' the Managers say in one of their Reports, 'that among the many advantages of the providential and family system, economy is not one.' Though the money is given chiefly in subscriptions and donations, a considerable sum comes in the form of contributions by relations, and earnings of children.

A Home was established in 1866 by Lady Emma Stanley and Lady Cecilia Molyneux, to receive girls from the West Derby Union. It is not certified, but Guardians from the West Derby and neighbouring unions send their girls to it, as they would to a foster-home, paying at the rate of their calculated cost in the Workhouse, which is 4s. in some cases and 4s. 3d. in others. The school managers provide the girls with an excellent outfit when they leave for service. This is generally at the age of fifteen or sixteen. The Guardians pay surprise visits, and the sanitary inspector examines the state of the premises annually. The girls are thoroughly well trained, and cases of failure in service have been exceedingly rare. The Home started first with only six or seven girls, but, owing to its success, is now enlarged to hold twenty or even five-and-twenty. We own to regret when we hear of these admirable little schools, which are doing such excellent work, enlarging themselves into institutions, as we believe the secret of their success and wholesome influence lies chiefly in their small numbers.

The Howard Orphan Home near Kendal, of which Mr. James Cropper is Honorary Secretary, was built in 1865 by the late Hon. Mrs. Howard of Levens Hall, who endowed it with £2,000. It receives destitute orphan girls from Kendal union, and, to fill vacancies, deserted children also. The house, which will accommodate forty, is beautifully arranged, and though too large to fulfil the idea of 'home,' is, for an institution, very cheerful and home-like. A matron and assistant form the whole staff; the girls attend a public elementary school, going and returning like other children, without escort. When the Report for 1887

was issued there were 32 girls in the Home, making 169 received since it was opened—of these 53 were in service, 5 in other occupations, and 26 were married; 21 had gone to friends or were otherwise provided for, and 21 had died. One was in an asylum, and of one only of the remaining 10 was the residence at the time unknown. Although the success in after-life falls short of the hopes of those most interested in the Home, it would appear, from the information we have obtained, to be satisfactory as compared with that of like institutions of similar size. The fact that three girls who are known to have lost character retrieved it, and are living respectably, shows that the good influence of the Home does not cease when its inmates leave it, and confirms the conviction that were all those who go friendless into the world from the workhouse school similarly watched over and helped, few would become castaways. The mortality at the Home seems unusually high, but orphans are generally delicate by inheritance, and we are told that so far as is known the deaths were all from consumption.

The girls cost per head, in 1887, for maintenance, officers' salaries, and school-fees, £11 : 13 : 2, being considerably less than in the preceding year; adding all other charges (there is no rent to pay), the total was about £14, payments by guardians defraying nearly half the expense of the Home. Here, as elsewhere, bad parents crop up when a child is old enough to be of use to them, and the labour, anxiety, and expense of its up-bringing—far worse, the child's future welfare—are sacrificed to the fetish of parental rights.

In 1861 the Countess of Devon opened a Home for eighteen workhouse girls, since raised to twenty-four, and others who are orphans or deserted. With the former the Guardians originally paid what they would cost in the workhouse, but this contribution has since been fixed at 4s. a week. The sum of £5 was expected with a child sent by private charity, substituted now by an annual payment of £10. The Home is at Kenton, close to Powderham Castle, whence the laundry and dairy departments were long ago transferred to it. The training which can thus be given to the girls prepares them, under efficient teachers,

to be good servants, and a large majority have done well, some in moderate, some in large households. They are admitted to the Home at various ages, but are not sent to service until sixteen, after being confirmed and becoming communicants. The benevolent foundress of the Home died many years ago, but in the active interest she took in it, she is succeeded by Viscountess Halifax.

This description of the various origins and arrangements of the Homes first established will apply, generally, to the majority of those which have more recently come into existence, the total number being now about a hundred and fifty. Some departures have, however, been made from the early type; for instance in some Homes only three or four inmates are received, and we have reason to believe that while these are more costly per head, the measure of success is greater.

A few are devoted to the reception of sickly or convalescent children; among them may be mentioned the Charlton Cottage Home near Malmesbury, of which Lady Victoria Howard is manager. The payment required is far below that of the large seaside institutions certified especially for pauper patients (which, too, it is to be feared reproduce some of the evils of the Workhouse), and the influences, moral and curative, of the smaller Home are so favourable that we hope Guardians will encourage the opening of many more by availing themselves fully of those already existing.

Excepting those for Roman Catholic children, very few of these Homes admit boys, yet we believe that to most lads domestic life is as essential as it is to girls; and in the hope that this conviction may be more fully accepted and acted on, we will describe a Home founded by Miss Synnot, the fellow-worker of Mrs. Nassau Senior, which may well serve as a model. It was opened several years ago in Clapham Park Road for twenty boys, under fourteen years of age, but has since been removed to a house at Milton Bryant, in Bedfordshire, built for them by Miss Synnot, and the number has been reduced to thirteen. At Clapham they were in charge of a kindly master and

matron, and treated, as far as possible, individually. A small garden and pens of rabbits and fowls were kept in order by the lads, who also do the work of the house. They attended an elementary school, and on reaching the appointed standard were allowed to go out to work in the morning, or for the whole day—in the latter cases receiving instruction in the evening. 'Thus they are, in all practical ways,' writes Miss Hesba Stretton, from whom we are quoting, 'placed on a level with the lot which would have been theirs when they turn out into the world.' She describes the Inglis Home (as it is named), to which they have been removed that they 'may have the advantages of country life and its sunny memories.' They share the work of a small homestead, produce for themselves fruit and vegetables, 'make and bake their own bread, churn their own butter, and in every way learn to meet the varying requirements of life.' Miss Stretton adds that they are outspoken manly lads, and contrasts the out-door healthy life of their well-controlled boyhood with that of the neglected children of the slums, or of the 'ranks and rows' of institution boys, inevitably reduced to a machine-like existence. After leaving the Inglis Home to work for themselves, former inmates have the privilege of returning to it for the holidays.[1]

Miss Synnot opened a Home for girls at Clapham at the same date as that for boys, and with the same home-like arrangements, and there it still remains. Twelve girls of various ages are received, and a forlorn baby to tend is a valuable element in their training.

Societies as well as individuals have recognised the value of these Training Homes, as that of the Gordon Homes and the Church of England Society for the rescue of Waifs and Strays. In the little magazine which the latter issues quarterly, valuable hints may be found for starting these Homes, particularly in the April number of 1884, in a letter signed by C. Parish. 'I incline to think,' says Mr. James Cropper, 'any very expensive system [of training pauper

[1] *An Account of the Homes for Children at Clapham and at Milton Bryant, Bedfordshire*, by Hesba Stretton. Batten & Davies, Clapham.

children] would probably be an unsuccessful one, whoever paid the money. Children who are not used to very frugal doings are disgusted with the inevitable economies of ordinary honest life.' Miss Parish's scheme, in its simple homeliness, avoids the well-known evil here pointed out by Mr. Cropper.

The cost of the children's maintenance in the Homes connected with the Waifs and Strays Society is chiefly met by an allowance from the Guardians, about equal to what it would have been in the workhouse. The family system is strictly maintained. Each Home is under the charge of a matron or 'Mother,' who teaches the girls domestic work, and sees that the children, whether boys or girls, under her care attend school regularly, and in short discharges a mother's duty towards them, her salary and the furniture of the cottage being usually supplied by subscriptions and donations raised by those who have started it. To be affiliated to the Society, it must have two managers, who are expected to meet some of the expenses; they receive and dispense payment from Guardians, and supervise the arrangements. The weekly expenditure in such a Home on the children need not exceed 4s. 7d. per head, inclusive of everything except extra expense in cases of illness.

One of the Society's Homes in the Midland counties, for boys, the cost of which has been mainly defrayed by Miss Anderdon, is devoted to their instruction in garden and farm work, to qualify them for life in the Colonies. The success attained is, we understand, most encouraging, but this particular Home is not certified under the Local Government Board, and therefore is scarcely available for pauper lads. We believe no more important work can be undertaken than that of multiplying simple Homes for workhouse boys who are not eligible for Boarding-out; and we trust that gentlemen, and ladies too, living in the country, may, more and more, interest themselves in it.

Numerous by comparison as are the Homes available for girls, they are altogether inadequate to receive all who might benefit from them, and an Association for promoting the establishment of Cottage Training Homes for Work-

house Girls was formed some time ago, with Miss Louisa Twining as its President. In a Commendatory Letter by Miss Twining, she says 'it is a work which ladies can inaugurate and encourage in their own unions, for, high or low, rich or poor, we all live within the circle of some union. All that is needed is a moderate sized house which can be adapted to the purpose of such a Home, and which can furnish a laundry and sufficient bedrooms, with a garden in addition.'[1] Miss Twining cites Lady Henry Somerset's description of the Home she opened at Reigate in 1884: 'The house that was adapted for the purpose was an ordinary dwelling-house with a small garden; a kitchen at the back was re-adapted for a wash-house, and one of the rooms was turned into an ironing-room. All the arrangements were made in the simplest possible way, in order that the girls, in learning their laundry-work, should not be accustomed to, nor dependent upon, any appliances that they were not likely to find in an ordinary private house. Although the intention of the Home was mainly to train the girls for laundry-work, we have not exclusively devoted the training to this department, as many girls are not adapted to take up this particular form of work for good. They receive, therefore, thorough training in house and kitchen work.

'. . . During the first half-year the girls were mainly employed in learning the first rudiments of laundry-work, but they very soon were able to take in enough work to make a good sum towards the expenses of the Home; and it may be said that after the first half-year the Home had been self-supporting [including, of course, payments of Guardians], with the exception of the salaries of the two matrons and the rent of the house.'[2]

Lady Beauchamp states that the girls leaving the very successful Home at Madresfield Court (also reported as practically self-supporting) are provided with an outfit worth about £5 : 10s., of which they return £3 out of their wages. Lady Clinton writes, 'My certified Industrial School at

[1] *Industrial Cottage Homes for Workhouse Girls*, L. Twining.
[2] *Ibid.*

Beaford, N. Devon, is supported by the payment of 4s. a week for each girl by Guardians, or others responsible for them, also by the sale of dairy produce, pigs, and poultry. The Home receives twelve children, and is managed by a matron. All the work is done by the inmates, with the exception of the cleaning of cow-sheds and pig-sties. The children attend the village school, and the Home now costs me nothing. I only wish that many such Homes for workhouse children could be established. I feel if people only knew that after the first expenditure the cost would be nominal (always supposing the Home to be managed by a careful matron), we should have many more Industrial Homes than we have at present. I shall be happy to give any further information that is required.'[1]

A resolution passed at a recent Conference of Lady Poor Law Guardians, and communicated to all Boards of Guardians in England and Wales, recommending that there should be a small voluntary Training Home for Girls available for every union, will, if received in a sympathetic spirit, give the Association ample employment.

The remarkable work of the Sisters of the Church at the Orphanage of Mercy, Kilburn, where many pauper children are taken, cannot be classed with that of these certified Homes, as their orphanage now contains more than 350 children—330 girls and 35 boys. There is, however, a vast difference between the Orphanage and an ordinary pauper school, in that it is a work and labour of love; the children being taught and tended entirely by the sisters. The older girls attend a school belonging to the orphanage, and a few of them become teachers of poor children, a post for which they are specially trained; others go into service. They look bright, happy, and healthy, and show no trace of the sullen pauper expression. They help in the house work, cooking, etc., and in taking care of the very little ones, received sometimes as young as two or three. The sanitary arrangements are excellent, and each little bed in the dormitories has a crochet or knitted cover of coloured wools, all the gifts and work of sympathising

[1] *Industrial Cottage Homes for Workhouse Girls*, L. Twining.

friends. This may seem a small detail, but the difference between long rows of monotonous counterpanes all of one pattern and these coverings, none of them quite alike, and each having its own little story of individual kindness, is very great. The floors are polished, which promotes cleanliness by diminishing dust, and is a great safeguard against ophthalmia. As the Home is not certified, the sisters rarely receive any payment from the Guardians. Indeed, sometimes it even happens that when a girl is sent from the workhouse, the officer who brings her waits to take back the workhouse clothes in which she was dressed, so that it is literally 'naked, and ye clothed me.' The expenses are met by subscriptions and donations. The children must be friendless, orphaned of both parents, and destitute, the only exceptions being cases where the surviving parent is insane. The orphanage is, as a school, under Government inspection, and obtains excellent reports from H.M. Inspectors. It has recently opened its doors to largely increased numbers; and we can only earnestly hope that the spirit infused by the self devotion of the Sisters will prevent the evils which are rarely separable from such increase

The plans we have been describing are intended to root out, by the influence of well-ordered Homes, the evils wrought by parental neglect and wicked example; or by what we may call training awry on the barrack system, and corrupting associations in the workhouse. Would it not be more economical for the ratepayer, and better for the child, to save it from having to unlearn wrong, while teaching it what is right? Whatever may be the creed of the different managers and promoters of these child-saving methods—whatever may be their special aim in training the children—they are unanimous on one point, the younger the child the easier the task. In several cases the Home was originally opened with the intention of merely supplementing the teaching of the pauper school, and giving the girls the benefit of a few years' special training before starting in life. But this plan was found so generally hopeless in the

case of the older girls (those, namely, over twelve) that it has been, we believe, everywhere modified; and best of all, when it can be done, is to receive the child at first without allowing it to enter the Workhouse at all.

The objects aimed at by voluntary Homes have sometimes been attempted by the Guardians themselves. In 1845 the Norwich Board of Guardians, impressed with the evils to which the children were exposed in their workhouse (since rebuilt), removed a few of the boys above school age —at the suggestion, we believe, of their medical officer Mr. Johnson—to a separate house, where they lodged under the care of the schoolmaster, while they worked for various employers in the city. Their board and clothing continued to be provided by the Guardians, who, in return, received their wages. The feeling that they had *money worth* proved morally invigorating to the lads; while the arrangement scattered them among the industrial population, so that when they grew up and left the House they had already a position in the world. The marked improvement in the boys led the Guardians, in 1850, to remove the elder girls, and subsequently all the children but the casuals and infants, to a house outside the city, which long proved an admirable training Home, while the pecuniary success of these Preventatories, a cumbrous but apt name, was such, that in a period of five years the saving to the rates was over £600.

Reporting upon the Homes in 1855, the Poor Law Inspector, Mr. Bowyer, stated that while the Norwich Workhouse had been 'to the children, especially, inevitable ruin,' their condition now was 'as high above, as it was previously below, that of the corresponding classes in other unions.' Again, in 1873-4, Mr. Bowyer's report is most favourable, and he particularly speaks of the influence which the 'working boys,' as the wage-earners were called, had on the rest. It is indeed therefore with amazement, as well as deep regret, that we have learned they were closed in 1880. The plan had been in successful operation for thirty-five years, when the Local Government Board ruled it illegal! An effort to obtain an amendment of the law seems not to have been thought of.

Happily, the Boys' Home may be said to have been partly revived, in spirit at least, though somewhat maimed in form, as it has been succeeded by a school away from the workhouse, and which more nearly resembles home than any other pauper school we know of, except perhaps that at Bridgend. The scholars number only 37; they join in the Church choir, do not wear a distinctive uniform, and are allowed considerable liberty. Admission to the Church choir is—though we fear rarely—permitted elsewhere; for instance at Upton-on-Severn, where the workhouse lads have also taken part with their choir companions in festivals at Worcester Cathedral, Tewkesbury Abbey, and Malvern Priory Church, and have been treated with uniform kindness by their fellow-members.[1]

The Home for girls was closed twelve years ago, and they remain in the Workhouse, but attend an Elementary School outside.

A somewhat similar experiment, intended to raise the pauper girl, was tried by the Guardians at Cork; in 1864 they opened an Industrial School for fifteen girls from their Workhouse. Four were received the first month, and the number gradually increased. The school was placed under the management of a committee of ladies, and fitted up in such a manner that the inmates could be instructed in laundry and house work. When first admitted, so ignorant were they of ordinary life that they did not know how to use knives and forks, and, indolent and listless, seemed unable to think, or it might be almost said even to *see* for themselves. Unfortunately, the house proved unfit for the purpose, and it was found necessary to close it in rather over a year, when nine inmates then undergoing training had to be otherwise provided for. Including these, seventy-seven girls, varying in age from nine to nineteen, had received more or less training. Considering that their average stay in the Workhouse had been nine years, and that some of them had been there from birth, the success attained was remarkable; though nineteen proved failures

[1] Speech of Mr. G. W. Hastings, M.P., *Sessional Proceedings of the Social Science Association*, 1882-3.

and nine returned to the Workhouse through illness, forty kept their places. 'The actual expenses of the Home for two years,' says the author of *Irish Homes and Irish Hearts*,[1] 'were £406 : 10s., and for this sum the result has been obtained that forty girls have been taken from the pauper class and are earning their bread respectably. It is quite certain that if they had remained in the Workhouse all their lives they would have cost a great deal more.'

It was afterwards intended to open another Home on a similar plan outside the city. This, unfortunately, has not been accomplished; but a female Industrial Superintendent has been added to the workhouse staff, who teaches the elder girls cooking, house work, etc. The arrangement is working well under the supervision of an outside committee of ladies; for women, it is to be greatly regretted, are not yet allowed to fill the post of Guardian in Ireland. Our informant, Mr. D'Esterre Parker, whose enlightened benevolence for a long period of service on the Cork Board has originated great improvements in poor relief, tells us, 'The demand for servants is so great that very young girls are taken for the purpose; they unfortunately return to the workhouse continually as their only home. This,' he adds, 'is the fundamental evil of rearing children in workhouses.'

Many years ago the attention of two ladies, already quoted, living in Dublin, the late Mrs. Woodlock and her friend Mrs. Atkinson, was drawn, by Mrs. Jameson's *Communion of Labour*, to the lamentable condition of girls in the workhouse. They had already devised a plan for rescuing from misery and destitution the female 'street arabs' of the city. A day school had been opened in which, besides mental training, the girls received instruction in laundry and needlework, and in the making of Irish lace for which the ladies succeeded in obtaining considerable orders. The workers lived chiefly at their own homes, often becoming the rent-payers, while sometimes they were the sole

[1] Longmans, 1867.

supporters of their families; and they were encouraged in every way to become respectable and self-supporting members of society.

The work had been so successful that its founders hoped it might be extended to workhouse girls, and sought permission to take a few under their care. Application was made to a gentleman in authority, a man of great benevolence: 'What,' was his answer, 'will you really take girls out of the workhouse? Do you know that they are all bad? Are you not aware that ninety-nine per cent are such as you dare not bring into your school?' A visit to the adult wards of the Workhouse convinced the applicants of the truth of this assertion. Eventually, a few younger girls were selected from the juvenile department of another union, upon whom it was decided the experiment should be made. They were first formed into a probationary class in the workhouse school, where the mistress undertook to prepare them for the particular kind of needlework they would have to execute; and gradually twelve were drafted into the outside school, which was also to be their home. The average age was 16½ years, and the average period they had spent in the workhouse 10½ years, so they were fair specimens of the training given there. They could read and write, they exhibited no vicious propensities, were honest, and did not tell lies; but they were sickly and spiritless, stupid to the last degree, and so totally devoid of a knowledge of common things that they seemed destitute of ordinary intelligence. One of them had never seen a railway train, and was so alarmed by the sight that it was with some difficulty she was induced to travel by it. They knew nothing of the use of money, and their utter indifference to the amount of mischief they might do was most perplexing to those who had taken charge of them. A curious fact revealed itself in the history of the little institution after the reception of these girls. During its early period a matron, of the social position such an officer usually holds, was found competent to its management; but when the workhouse girls were admitted her efficiency ceased, and it was not until a woman of education and

refinement—in other words, a lady—undertook the task, that these poor, undisciplined, and stupefied creatures could be successfully treated. Similar experience has been elsewhere gathered in the management of girls and women.

The intention had been to train the girls for service; but this was found impossible in regard to many, owing to helplessness and ignorance in domestic matters—on a par, probably, with that of an Irish servant-girl in Australia, who used the one word 'oven' for every form of cooking utensil. Perhaps, more hopeless than all was their liability to violent passion or dense sulkiness. The only way to mitigate the evil, if it cannot be uprooted, 'is to believe firmly that the child has been born with a heart and feelings like other people, and seek out these buried treasures at any cost. One gets into deep soundings, but the search is seldom altogether in vain.' So said these ladies, and so they acted.

The institution was made as home-like as possible. Intercourse with the *extern* pupils, with their knowledge of ordinary life and devotion of their earnings to their own support and that of their relations, proved most beneficial to the interns, and after a time they yielded to the many good influences brought to bear. Banishment to the workhouse was held over them as the greatest possible punishment, while a crowning reward for good conduct was permission to bring thence a former companion, when a vacancy occurred in the Home, the girl being, as it were, bail for the good behaviour of her *protégée*—an interesting adaptation of the principle of the Saxon frank-pledge, which also inspired the course successfully adopted with his prisoners by Capt. Maconochie, when governor of Norfolk Island.

Careful teaching soon enabled the girls to earn a few pence during the week, and this, in course of time, mounted to shillings. But the lesson of self-dependence was learnt slowly and imperfectly; and the unwillingness to accept a suggestion made to some of them, that, now being able to support themselves, they might remove to lodgings, revealed the disposition still remaining to depend upon the care of others for the provision of food and shelter, and indicated a defect in the institution, inseparable, probably,

from any artificial arrangement to replace the natural home. Gradually, however, the reluctance to self-dependence was overcome, and the old pupils established themselves in lodgings under the friendly supervision of the ladies, but induced as much as possible to procure work for themselves. They were enrolled in a small religious association with the ladies, which maintained the bond between them, and their benefactors frequently visited them at their work.

A plan in some degree resembling that we have just described arose in later years in connection with the South Dublin Union. Two 'Ladies Visiting associations' were established, the one Protestant, the other Catholic, which, limiting their ministrations strictly to the followers of their respective creeds, worked side by side in harmony, and attained remarkable success. By means of teaching and friendly intercourse some even of the adult women were fitted for service, but for the greater number employment was obtained at factories, they being allowed to sleep at the workhouse until able to earn wages enough to pay for a lodging.[1] This was then found for them in respectable, though very humble families—a better plan, as experience has proved, than collecting them in even a small Home. In former times the young women of the Dublin unions were known only for their lawless behaviour and utter insubordination. They would break out in rebellion, and having exhausted every means of control in the workhouse, they would frequently be taken before the magistrates and sent to prison.

'We have heard a Guardian say,' we are informed by a writer on Irish Workhouses, 'that during one of the frequent outbreaks in the union, he has seen all the wardmasters, the street police, and the whole body of Guardians assembled on Board day, standing at fault before a yardful of these desperate girls, and succeeding only after a long

[1] The same privilege was granted some time ago at a London Workhouse to a few young women, fit only for unskilled labour, and even at that unable to earn enough for subsistence till they had gained some experience. We believe that the plan, carefully supervised, would 'float' many of the humblest class of workers, whom illness or other misfortune has brought into the workhouse, and where, without help in starting afresh, they often remain permanent burdens on the rates.

delay, and the use of the rudest physical force, in securing and carrying off to prison the ringleaders of the tumult.'[1] It was the members of this same class, in some instances the very individuals who had been sentenced to gaol, who by the influence of Christian gentlewomen were converted into self-respecting, docile, and industrious citizens, free, it is to be hoped, for ever from the workhouse, and absorbed into the respectable working population. It happens to be known that one of them, after she had attained to this position, chanced to read in a piece of old newspaper, which had wrapped a companion's lunch, an account of her own behaviour in one of these outbreaks.

The societies which wrought this good work still exist, but the need for them has been lessened by improved administration in the workhouses themselves. Religious sisterhoods are now regularly at work in those of Dublin; the Roman Catholic girls being very much under the charge of the nuns, especially for industrial training: while the Deaconesses interest themselves in the Protestants. Since the appointment, a few years ago, of a Deaconess as Matron of the South Dublin workhouse, outbreaks among the women have wholly ceased. Indeed the recent history of the two great workhouses of Dublin is a most encouraging example of the power which religious and refined women can exercise over the lowest and most turbulent of their sex, if only they have the judgment to rule firmly and, at the same time, the loving-kindness to show helpful sympathy.

A very valuable institution was opened by Miss Twining in 1861, in New Ormond Street, for girls who, having gone to service, chiefly from pauper schools, were, from whatever cause, out of place, and to whom, as we have already said, no shelter was open but the adult ward of the workhouse.

A remarkable objection was raised to the scheme when first proposed, namely, that 'no girls who went into the workhouse were worth trying to save, as all were already bad; none who had any character left would go there, or would be needing help after having been once launched in service on leaving the schools;' a cruel

[1] *Journal of the Workhouse Visiting Society*, Feb. 1860.

calumny upon those who, debarred from making friends by long seclusion in the schools, had no refuge from starvation, when cast adrift, perhaps from no actual fault, but the workhouse or the streets! The following is a fair instance of the class for whom the Home was established. 'M. L., aged sixteen, an orphan, and does not remember her parents, has been three years in a District School, so has more learning than the rest, but also more knowledge of evil, much of which was unfortunately derived from a wicked woman in the adult ward where she was placed on leaving her situation to return to the workhouse, though she remained there only six weeks. She had had three different places since she left the school, at coffee shops, which seem to offer sad risks and temptations to these poor friendless girls, up late at night and early in the morning, with no rest even on Sundays; it is indeed surprising if any remain in such situations with good characters.'[1]

After doing excellent work the institution had to be closed for want of funds. The cost per head had averaged about 7s. weekly, while the Guardians' contributions only amounted to about half that sum. It is matter for regret that so excellent and much-needed an institution should not have received adequate support; but so far as the metropolitan district is concerned, the need for such homes is now happily superseded by the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants (known as M.A.B.Y.S.), of which the Rev. Brooke Lambert is chairman.

A terrible instance of cruelty to a girl from a workhouse caused the passing of an Act, the 14 and 15 Vict. c. 11, intended for the protection of young servants and apprentices. It requires Guardians to cause their Relieving Officer to visit any child under sixteen still in the service to which he or she was sent from the Workhouse, and to report in writing on its condition at least twice yearly. Subsequently they were authorised to appoint the chaplain to perform this duty instead of the relieving officer. But very few of these young people, unless apprenticed, remain in their first place more than an extremely short time, and thus a large propor-

[1] *Journal of the Workhouse Visiting Society*, May 1861.

tion were soon lost sight of and utterly without protection. Even supposing, however, they had remained in the place to which they had been sent, a half-yearly official visit could do little to sustain them in their first experience of the work-a-day world, and their hard struggle to accommodate themselves to entirely new and often very difficult conditions; while as regards the girls, it is obvious that neither relieving officer nor chaplain, however kind, could do much for them. A lady inspector, Mrs. Senior, at once discovered the need for a woman's sympathy and influence; and though many a good-hearted matron was equally alive to this want, the absorbing duties of her office usually made it impossible for her to fulfil her desire. To meet this crying need Mrs. Senior suggested an organisation of ladies. Her plan, which she stated at length in the Appendix to her 'Report on the Education of Girls in Pauper Schools,'[1] obtained at once the approval and powerful aid of her own sex, and before she had passed away, the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants was in active work. It has steadily developed in extent and efficiency, and now forms a noble memorial to its founder. Further legislation for the protection of children from workhouses has increased its value. Under the 39 and 40 Vict. c. 61, Guardians may appoint any officer or other *competent person* to visit and report upon these young people, and one after another of the Metropolitan Boards of Guardians are availing themselves of the services of the Association for the supervision of their girls, and of the many other benefits it affords. 'Advantages should be offered not to Workhouse girls *as such*,' observes Mrs. Senior, 'but generally to orphans and friendless young servants who are willing to enrol themselves as members of a young servants' friendly society, under the management of ladies, as hereinafter to be described.'[2]

But it is with pauper girls we are concerned, and of whom therefore we now speak in connection with the Association.

The 'advantages' proposed by Mrs. Senior are of a very

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1873-74. [2] *Ibid.*

varied and comprehensive character, and the duties of the ladies, now between eight and nine hundred, who undertake to visit the girls, proportionately responsible. The name of each girl on going to service, and the address of her employer, are communicated by the workhouse authorities to the Central Office of the Association (18 Buckingham Street, Strand), and are there immediately recorded. These are given to the lady visitor for the district where the girl is placed, whom it then becomes her duty to visit at least once a month, and generally to befriend as occasion arises. Of the admirable 'Suggestions to Visitors,' issued by the Association, the first is that the introductory visit be paid to the mistress, not the maid, and that if possible no communication be held with the latter until the mistress has been seen and her permission obtained. By this and other reasonable methods her co-operation is generally secured, while the girl finds her mistress's authority is supported, and that to win the regard of her new friend she must exert herself to keep her place and do well. It is also advised that the visitor should, so far as possible, secure from the mistress information of her servant being likely to leave, and provide each with her own written address.

On December 31st, 1887, the Association had in its care 6983 young servants, and, under the management of twenty-eight district committees, there are safe Registry Offices and lodgings, Homes for those out of place, and also Training Homes. These latter may be regarded as finishing (we had almost said *beginning*) schools for imperfectly taught girls, and include a Laundry Training Home for those not suited for general domestic service. For the sick the Association provides Hospital and convalescent tickets; for the healthy, tea-parties and friendly meetings, and a cheerful room, open on Sunday afternoons, for the homeless, where classes are held by ladies for those who desire to attend.

Among the many good offices rendered to the girls by the ladies, a very helpful one is that of going shopping with them, and teaching them how to lay out their hard won wages to the best advantage. Their ignorance of the

value and use of money is almost incredible. Many of them seem to look upon half a sovereign as a fortune, and expect it to buy boots, hat, dress, and jacket; few of them have any notion of choosing a material for good wearing qualities, and indeed know no difference between a serviceable or unserviceable stuff, while many are naturally tempted to spend their money on the finery from which they have been so strictly debarred. In cases of destitution, the Association provides clothes or advances small sums for outfits, receiving repayment from wages by instalments. It continues its motherly supervision until the girls marry or reach the age of twenty, when they have passed through the most trying and tempted period of their youth.

Though the work was originally suggested to Mrs. Nassau Senior's mind by the special need of protection for pauper school girls, it would seem that the extern children whom she also sought to befriend have benefited hitherto more numerously. Thus 4910 of its members come from outside sources, and only 2073 from pauper schools—a proportion which we trust will be somewhat changed as the labours of the Association become more widely appreciated by Boards of Guardians.[1]

It is pleasant to record that the mistresses of the girls very rarely refuse the visits of the ladies; indeed, as a rule, they value them highly. As one of them said, 'I am glad for the poor thing to have a friend.' Some instances of the opposite kind do of course occur. An injudicious, or unreasonable, or even cruel or dishonest employer is sometimes met with. A lady may have to remove a girl at a moment's notice, or with equal haste secure her admission to a Home or Hospital when she has been summarily dismissed for some real or supposed fault, or because too ill to do her work. Her employer may detain her small belongings, or refuse to pay wages justly due; and the lady has to bring the authority of the Association to bear to obtain justice for her little charge. Or it may be that the girl is ill-tempered, lazy, or insubordinate, and all the visitor's tact and

[1] Report of the Association for 1887.

patience, aided by the forbearance of a kindly mistress, may be taxed to the uttermost to overcome these faults, to awaken in the dulled, starved heart a response to kindness, and to inspire the wish, and, if possible, create the power to do better. It is only by this hand to hand, or rather heart to heart struggle that the spark of good inherent in all, but perverted and stifled in these poor creatures by the circumstances under which they came into existence, and by the unnatural conditions of their childhood, can be fanned into flame and made the motive power of their future life. That the unobtrusive but unwearied labours of the members of this Association do largely succeed in their loving efforts is seen by the ever-growing proportion among the girls they befriend who become good and useful members of society.

We give the following fuller description of one of the M.A.B.Y.S. Homes than our space has permitted in regard to others, as it receives a special and very pitiable class, for whose relief elsewhere it may perhaps be useful as a model.

Mrs. Nassau Senior enumerates in her Report to the Local Government Board cases she met with in the course of her inspection of pauper schools, exciting deep sympathy, but very difficult to help. They were girls (and had she inspected the boys' schools she would have found like instances there) suffering from some bodily or mental defect which prevented their being launched in life with their companions, and whom compassionate Matrons had retained in the schools though far beyond school age, to save them from their only other refuge, the adult wards of the workhouse. For the defective in health Mrs. Senior suggested boarding-out, but we are not aware that any Guardians have acted on the suggestion; indeed, Poor-law regulations greatly hamper departures from the common groove. For the mentally weak she regretfully owns she can think of no practicable method of relief. The vast Asylums for Imbeciles erected in late years by the Metropolitan Board have probably received many of the poor creatures who moved her compassion. But the cost of thus providing for them is very great, and notwithstanding the almost lavish

arrangements for their comfort and entertainment, it is at least doubtful whether they would not be far happier, as well as far less costly, under simpler arrangements. The thankfulness of a young woman who, on discharge from a lunatic asylum, was sent to a country cottage to regain her strength before entering again on service, when she found it was not an 'institution,' gives some indication of the preference that may be generally felt for a more home-like refuge.

It is believed that the magnificent asylums, like the palatial schools, are attractive to the friends of patients if not satisfactory to themselves, and that many persons are tempted by them to cast upon the public the cost of children or other relatives whom they are quite capable of taking care of themselves. But there is no doubt that young people are sent to employment from the schools who are from dulness and backwardness of intellect, physical defects or delicacy, and want of training, unable to succeed, and it is one of the sad problems M.A.B.Y.S. has to solve —how to make them capable of self-support. Some of these poor creatures have, after every effort has been made, to be returned to the Workhouse; but a Home was opened in March 1887 in connection with the Whitechapel Branch of the Association, which promises to save many from this sad necessity.[1] Six girls only were received at first, but it has since been found desirable to raise the number to twelve. The faces of some clearly show the deficiency of intellect; and imperfect articulation amounting almost to dumbness, and a halting gait, are among the physical defects to be overcome in others. Three of the present inmates, incapacitated for service by physical disease, are invaluable inmates. Well-disposed themselves, they exercise a wholesome control over the others, while their infirmities have roused the dormant sympathy and affection of their companions. Through the heart the intellect is reached, and though, when the Home was started, it was expected one or even two years' residence might be necessary, some

[1] *First Report of the Home for Day-Servants*, 45 Aubert Park, Highbury.

of these poor dull creatures have been fitted in the course of a few months to take places carefully selected for them, where a kindly mistress will help on the development of their newly awakened powers. The preliminary training comes in work done within the Home, including all scrubbing and other cleaning and the washing, and this is followed by a period of outside employment in charing and washing, of a kind of course suited to their strength,—a sort of probationary employment which has proved very helpful in another Home for workhouse girls as a preparation for domestic service.

Lively games, such as Post, the Family Coach, etc., are found of great use in awakening memory, exciting attention, and sharpening the power of observation, and by the kind help of a manager an evening weekly is made in this way bright and useful. The new-comers are quite unable to take an intelligent part in what is going on, but soon get interested, and in time fully share the fun.

The arrangements of the Home are as nearly as possible those of a family, and the motherly influence of a matron with her heart in her work increases the resemblance. The privilege granted to one girl 'tormented by a devil,' in the form of an exceptionally violent temper, to call her 'Mother,' has had a marvellous effect in bringing out the poor child's utmost power of self-control; while to another the novel experience that 'people are sorry when she's punished,' has begun to soften her extreme obduracy. Some correction is needful in dealing with these wayward natures, but it is of the mildest form. That which is most felt is exclusion from recreation, or the withdrawal of the approving notice of a much-loved lady-visitor. 'I praise whenever I can,' said the Matron; 'praise and encouragement are much better than punishment.'

The managers of the Home are careful not to relieve relatives or friends who can contribute, or Boards of Guardians sending girls, from due payment, and they obtain some aid from the humble earnings of the girls themselves; for the bulk of their expenses, and these must be comparatively heavy, they rely upon donations and subscriptions.

These from one direction come in touching guise — in response, namely, to an appeal to girls placed out by the Whitechapel Branch, and now doing well in service, to help their younger and much afflicted sisters.

The statistics of the Association show some three-quarters of these *protégées* conducting themselves satisfactorily in service, while a small contingent described as 'unsatisfactory' are more likely under its kindly care to rise into the class above it than to sink into that below entitled 'bad,'[1] whose numbers happily form less than 3 per cent of the whole. Some of the remainder have married, or emigrated respectably; while of many of those reported as unfit for service, visits refused, lost sight of, etc., there is no reason to despair, though doubtless these categories include some failures. Very few have died.

Although these statistics are less favourable than those of the same class of children brought up apart from pauper influences, they testify to the excellent work of the Association, and the self-devotion of her members. To appreciate these, the character of the material they have to work upon must be realised. The dulness, shiftlessness, and sullen temper induced by the conditions of school-life have to be patiently met and gradually overcome; and the endurance and kindly feeling of employers invoked to the uttermost. One place after another has to be found until the angular, notched peg has been smoothed and polished, and settles eventually in the round hole. Ignorance and perversity have to be conquered in the Training Homes, and poor constitutions to be built up in those established at the sea-side or other convalescent resorts, and infirmities remedied, which under the individual observation of a Boarding-out Committee would have been treated and overcome while yet only incipient. When it is understood that these poor girls, after years of costly maintenance in the Schools, can be ranked only as on a level with the *extern* girls from the poorest London homes, the unremitting toil and inexhaustible sympathy demanded

[1] Defined as 'known to have lost character, or who have been in prison for theft, etc.'

and given to obtain the results we have recorded may be estimated.

There are, besides, other excellently organised Societies and Associations, both in London and the provinces, for the help and protection of workhouse as well as other girls, notably the Girls' Friendly Society, on somewhat the same lines as M.A.B.Y.S., but working chiefly in the provinces. It does not limit its ministrations to girls employed in domestic service, but includes all classes of young female workers. In this Society the local secretaries give the girls introductions when they go to fresh places in a new district, securing for them kindly supervision. It has Lodging, Training, and Convalescent Homes for them, and arranges help for them in sickness, pleasure in health, and the advantage of intercourse with kindly and educated friends. Workhouse girls form a separate branch of the Society. The number of workhouses to which its visitors are admitted has increased from 284 in 1887 to 308 in 1888, and they are welcomed at one district school in the diocese of Norwich. As its growing success and that of the sister Association in London in raising the percentage of girls who do well in after life becomes generally known, admission to every pauper school will surely be offered. To refuse such generous efforts to brighten the lives of these young creatures and diminish the burden their failure to do well must throw on the rates, would be at once cruel and wasteful.

There are, besides, Homes for Working Girls, available for those brought up in workhouses, where many benefits may be obtained for a small weekly payment, and which are superintended by devoted ladies. Nor are the boys forgotten; the Homes for Working Boys are invaluable for those who have no decent homes of their own. Eight are in operation under the London Society. In Bristol they bear the honoured name of Mary Carpenter. An admirable one founded and superintended by Major Fordyce, receives boys at Birmingham, and they are to be found in other of our large towns more or less utilised by Boards of Guardians. There is, however, no organisation in existence for aiding

boys at all equal to the need. Yet lads want the advice and sympathy of older and more experienced friends quite as much as girls.

Emigration is a method of providing for the Children of the State which has many warm advocates among devoted men and women, and special advantages are claimed under the scheme. It was not, however, originally organised for pauper children. Miss Maria S. Rye and Miss Macpherson, we believe the earliest labourers in the cause, but working independently of each other, directed their first efforts to the rescue of 'Street Arabs' and other neglected children of our overgrown cities; but after a time they included children from workhouses in their scheme, the Guardians defraying the cost in whole or part. Boards of Guardians have not generally, however, shown much eagerness to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded by these benevolent ladies, though some have recognised it as the most economical plan of providing for pauper children, as after the preliminary expenses they are quite off the rates, and generally get a good start in life. The numbers emigrated are, however, increasing, and were largest in 1887, when 411 were sent to Canada at a cost to the rates of £4192, or rather over £10 per head.[1] The other advantages claimed are severance from evil connections, improved physical conditions, and the demand for labour, which makes the prospect of employment, it is believed, a certain one. Moreover, it is found that the chances of adoption in Canada are good. The hard-toiling Canadians have, it is said, comparatively few children, and these are accustomed to quit the parent-home early, so that the new-comers are doubly valuable for the services children can always render on a farm.

To these gains there is, however, a serious *per contra*. First, is the vital question of the expediency or not of State-aided emigration. We have yet to see whether this means outlet or merely displacement. It would be no permanent gain to us, whatever it may be to the young emigrant, to send away our own children if their places be

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1887-88.

immediately filled by the immigration of foreigners. Secondly, the alleged fact that there are few children in Canada gives anxiety lest those we send will not be prized as children so much as young, and therefore cheap, labourers. Certainly it would seem an extravagant policy to give them an expensive education and then hand them over to Canada, as long as there is demand for skilled labour at home; and yet the Canadians naturally object to receiving 'ne'er-do-wells,' too lazy and too shiftless for honest work, and who only burden the community whether here or in the Far West. Then there is the difficulty of consent. A child whose parents or grandparents are living cannot be emigrated without their permission, and even uncles and aunts and brothers and sisters, who, not being responsible for maintenance, have no legal claim to be heard in the matter, are not infrequently allowed thus to blast the child's prospects, and cast to the winds the results of his education paid for out of the ratepayers' pockets. At present only orphans or deserted children can be sent away, their own consent being previously obtained before two justices of the peace or a stipendiary magistrate.

The trouble taken to comply with all these requirements may prove to have been thrown away. We know of an instance in which, after their fulfilment, a Board allowed itself to be prevailed upon by a relative, very unsuitable for the care of a child, to give it up to him, although the child, a lad of fourteen, was anxious to go; and we believe such instances are not rare. To prevent the risk of such lost labour, some Boards of Guardians cause lists of the children it is proposed to emigrate to be advertised beforehand, and a considerable number are usually withdrawn from their keeping in consequence. For these and other reasons comparatively few pauper children have been emigrated; but as the number is increasing, and this may become a very important means of rescuing them from pauperism, we will state the methods by which it has been and may be used.

In 1869 Miss Rye sailed for Canada with 73 children, principally girls, 51 of whom were from workhouses. A

great part of the expense was met by donations.[1] She took them first to a Depôt Home she had prepared for them at Niagara, and from this centre she soon succeeded in placing them all out, one-seventh being adopted. The Poor Law Board did not, however, sanction emigration until the following year, 1870, when 149 children were sent to Canada under the care of Miss Rye and Miss Macpherson, whose benevolent services it warmly recognised.[2] 451 followed in 1871. But the plan, though favoured by our Government as well as by that of Canada, obtained little support from Guardians generally.

In 1874 some unfavourable accounts of the condition of the children which reached the Local Government Board caused them to institute an inquiry by their Inspector, Mr. Doyle, which he extended to the non-pauper children also who had been taken out, no difference of any kind being made between them, either by Miss Rye or Miss Macpherson or by the Canadians. He pays a high tribute to the self-devotion and active labours of these ladies, and as regards the little children who had been adopted, he attributes to them the highest credit for originating this method of providing for them.[3] Although he inquired at the Depôt Homes respecting every child, and visited about 400, he found no instance of gross cruelty, but he met with some undoubted cases of ill-treatment and hardship, such as may, we fear, be matched among children in English workhouses and those sent to service from them at home.

The result of what appears to have been a very full and careful inquiry may be summed up in Mr. Doyle's remark —'the work has rapidly outgrown the means provided for carrying it on.' A want of more complete and effective supervision was obvious, and he cites an Order in Council by the Canadian Government which he thinks, together with suggestions he makes for local visiting of the children, would

[1] *First Report on the Placing-out of Pauper and other Orphans in Canada and the United States of America*, by Maria S. Rye.

[2] *Report of the Poor Law Board*, 1870-71.

[3] *Emigration of Pauper Children to Canada*, by Andrew Doyle, Esq., 1875.

provide the necessary safeguards. He also pointed out that much discomfort and suffering on the voyage, to the children and those in charge of them, might be obviated by making the parties smaller and increasing the number of attendants,—a suggestion which has, we believe, modified recent arrangements, but at added expense.

Several years elapsed, however, before the English authorities were satisfied, and the immediate effect of Mr. Doyle's Report was the withdrawal from Poor Law Guardians of permission to emigrate pauper children. At length, in 1883, it was again granted, to be once more temporarily withdrawn.

Occasionally, in their anxiety and interest about their little emigrants, the Guardians have themselves visited Canada to inquire after them. Mr. John Holding, of the West Derby Union, did this in 1885, and expressed himself well-pleased with his inspection; while in 1887 Mr. H. Aveling, Clerk to the Paddington Board of Guardians, went out at their request for the same purpose.[1] Miss Rye happened to be taking out a large party of girls by the steamer in which Mr. Aveling sailed, and he was thoroughly satisfied with the arrangements made for their comfort and safety. In Canada he was also satisfied with what he saw, but he is inclined to recommend a different method of inspection from that adopted by the Local Government Board.

It may be well to postpone a final decision until experience shows which of various plans is best. Whichever may prevail, it should, we would suggest, include, when possible, inquiry of the young people, after living some time in Canada, whether they are glad to have left England and are hopeful of their future in the land of their adoption. Mr. Doyle in 1874, and Mr. Aveling thirteen years after, met with several cases of home-sickness among the new arrivals, and it is difficult to judge how far their discontent was justified; but compared with the number sent out, these cases appear to be rare.

[1] *Emigration of Destitute Children;* report by the Clerk to the Paddington Poor Law Guardians, 1887.

In the meanwhile, whatever the Local Government Board Orders might be, the plan of emigrating the waifs of our great cities was too tempting to be abandoned. Among other workers Mr. J. H. Middlemore has laboured in this field with ardent devotion for many years, and an account of his plan will stand for that of the others, as they all nearly resemble each other. He assembles the children in his Training Home at S. Luke's Road, Birmingham, some months previous to their crossing the Atlantic, when he either accompanies them himself, or sends them under other trusted escort. They are received at a Distributing Home in Ontario, and usually within a month's time all are placed out for adoption or service. Occasionally a few remain longer on hand, and sometimes a child is returned or taken back from its selected home. In such cases the Distributing Home affords necessary shelter until it can be placed out again. The foster-parents and employers are chosen after careful inquiry; the children of suitable age attend schools under Government inspection, and are frequently visited in their homes.

In the course of fourteen years, 1255 neglected and destitute children have thus been taken to Canada. A considerable proportion of these are now married, while many a sickly child has been restored to health by the happy conditions of its new home.[1] By far the larger portion of the children thus emigrated are not paupers, and the expenditure for them is met by private donations and subscriptions. With each child sent by the Guardians the sum of £10 has been paid, but this does not cover the cost of voyage, outfit, and residence in the Receiving and Distributing Homes. Mr. Middlemore considers that £12 would be a fairer contribution. Others practically acquainted with the subject agree with him, and in consequence of the representations of one of these, the Rev. T. Seddon, Secretary to the Canadian Catholic Emigration Committee, the Local Government Board have now sanctioned an expenditure of £11 per head. It certainly seems

[1] *Report of the Emigration Home at Birmingham*, 1887; and *Sessional Proceedings of the Social Science Association*, 1882-83.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

only just if advantage is taken of the philanthropic aid of private individuals in removing children permanently from the rates, that that fund should defray all the pecuniary expense.

Mr. Middlemore has never had difficulty in finding homes, nor has it ever been necessary for him to put a boy or girl into one he did not approve, because no others were open to him. He states unreservedly, that the reasons for this Canadian willingness to receive the children are not sentimental ones. Except perhaps in cases of adoption, he thinks the children are taken primarily as young workers in a land where labour is scarce, but family affection usually follows. It is, he believes, mainly a question of demand and supply, but he considers the demand will yet continue many years, if wisely met, *i.e.* if only strong and capable children be sent.

Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., has long been a warm advocate of Emigration, and an earnest worker in the cause in connection with an important organisation in Liverpool which in ten years sent out 1200 children of the lowest class. Six months' training in a Home is given before their departure, a probationary measure which he regards as essential; and they are sent out in batches of 100. Mr. Mark Whitwell of Bristol is another worker in the same field, and frequently visits the young people he has helped to emigrate in their Canadian homes.

With such evidence before it of the results of emigration, the Local Government Board, having obtained the co-operation of the Canadian Government in securing a satisfactory system of inspection and reports, issued, in 1887, a Revised Memorandum assenting to the emigration of children on certain conditions. This, as further revised in 1888, sets forth carefully considered provisions, which must be fulfilled by Guardians, to secure the safety of the children when emigrated. To prepare them for emigration it requires that 'a child, before being sent to Canada, shall have been under previous instruction for at least six months—(*a*) in a workhouse or separate school under the Guardians, or a district school; or at a Public Elementary

school at the cost of the Guardians; or (*b*) in a school certified by the Board under the 25 and 26 Vict. cap. 43. It will not be regarded as essential that such period of instruction shall immediately precede the emigration.'[1] The alternative of instruction 'at a public elementary school,' which has been added during the last revision, is of great importance. It brings within the category of those eligible for emigration, workhouse children who are attending outside elementary schools—those, namely, of half our provincial unions; and includes also boarded-out children.

But to the six months' probation in a pauper school we see objections which lead us to hope the Memorandum may be still further revised. If its purpose were the bodily cleansing and purifying from filthy habits which those experienced in emigrating the children of our lowest classes declare to be necessary before transferring them to Canadian homes, the provision would be intelligible. But this clearly is not the motive, as the prescribed probation may have occurred at any period of the child's life. Moreover, the orphan of respectable parents does not require purification, and runs great risk in the pauper school of being injured instead of benefited. And, as the Canadians express a strong and very natural objection to importing pauperism, it seems inexpedient needlessly to tar with the brush children intended for emigration.

If the intention of the requirement be moral reform, and some training in the occupations of colonial life, we believe this can be better achieved in Emigration Homes than in any Poor-law establishment. It is to be expected that the Managers of the Homes will certify them under 25 and 26 Vict. c. 43 (where this has not been already done), and so bring them within the regulations of the Local Government Board. The ordinary Certified Homes, on the plan of Mrs. Way's, are unlikely to receive such children, especially with the expectation of having to part with them in six months' time, though as a satisfactory means of providing for suitable girls after some years'

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1887-88,

training, they might be glad to avail themselves of the aid from Guardians which the Memorandum sanctions.

Probably the inclusion of boarded-out children in the Memorandum will affect but a small proportion, because, as a rule, they become absorbed into our working population at home. But instances occur from time to time in which, owing to disreputable connections, or, in a girl, incapacity to rise to high-class domestic service, or a roving spirit in a boy, emigration is a boon; while their up-bringing in the natural conditions of home-life has been an excellent preparation for it, and by cutting the child off from pauperism has made it more acceptable in Canada.

The Memorandum recommends 10 as the extreme limit of age for emigrating girls, and prohibits it above 12, except in extraordinary cases. There are great advantages in planting children in a new country while they are yet young enough to grow up its citizens; and though there are many girls of twelve, and not a few unhappily below that age, who have a precocious knowledge of evil, rendering them unfit for Canadian or any homes, yet there is, too, a large proportion of much older girls brought up in Certified Homes besides those boarded-out, who are free from such stain, and to whom emigration offers a prosperous career. This clause also we trust may be reconsidered, particularly in remembrance of the sensitiveness of our Canadian cousins to Canada being made a 'dumping ground' (whatever that may mean) for British paupers.

In the first edition of this book a chapter was devoted to apprenticeship to mill-owners as a mode of providing for the Children of the State; and an account was given of interesting experiments made by different manufacturers, to educate and utilise little paupers by receiving them as apprentices under conditions carefully framed to secure their welfare. One of the most successful of these efforts was begun more than a hundred years ago by a family in the north of England distinguished both in philanthropy and literature. For thirty years in a well arranged Apprentice House boys and girls were taught, fed, and maintained. No premium

was paid with them, but they were expected to bring two suits of clothing. They received no wages, as the value of their labour during the latter years of their apprenticeship was required to compensate for their cost in the early portion. When they could accomplish a certain amount of work a small sum, as a reward, was laid by for them weekly, a little of which was sometimes given to them as pocket money, but the chief accumulated to supply them with a fund on going out into the world, and to procure any needful additions to the outfit then provided by the mill-owner. He and his family took a practical interest in the conduct and welfare of each child. They themselves conducted the Sunday classes the children attended, and they personally carried into effect a kindly scheme of reward for good behaviour. The young people, as they grew up, usually settled in the neighbourhood, marrying their fellow-apprentices in the villages, and most of the women proved good and thrifty wives.

For more than thirty years, over which our informant's close acquaintance with the working of the system extended, only two girls were guilty of immorality during apprenticeship. After that period more instances occurred, but not many, considering how entirely, and usually at the early age of eighteen, they became independent of control. This sudden and complete enfranchisement, after many years of restraint, is indeed spoken of as one of the drawbacks of the system, but it is one, at any rate, shared by the pauper school, where it is still more to be deplored as occurring at a much earlier age. Some means of exercising a diminishing authority, until the power of self government is fully acquired, is much needed for the young people leaving our various State institutions, to earn their living and to be consequently independent.

Some 600 children had grown up in the Apprentice House, and had started in life, able to support themselves respectably, when the death of the Superintendent caused a change. His widow said she was sure the House could not go on satisfactorily without a man to share the management; but she was induced by her em-

ployer to try, and the boys were dismissed in the hope of rendering her task more easy. It was found, however, that their absence diminished still further the resemblance to family life, one feature of which was lost in the death of the Superintendent or Father; and a consequence was that the elder girls became less steady. Before, if they behaved lightly, they were sure to hear of it from the boys, who thus exercised a brother's check upon them; while they no doubt supplied, in accordance with Nature's scheme, a wholesome influence over the boys. Other circumstances, combining—among them the outcry (following the first Poor Law Commission) against the system of parish apprenticeship, an outcry generally too well founded, but which, nevertheless, caused many beneficent enterprises to be swept away, together with the horrors it condemned—the Apprentice House was closed in 1835.

In the previous year one of the sons of its founder, residing in another district, driven by the scarcity of labour, took a few parish apprentices into his employment, and adopted with them almost the same course his father had pursued. He never had any serious wrong to complain of among these young persons; they associated on equal terms with respectable working people, and were in fact absorbed into that class. During the cotton famine he allowed the girls then in the Apprentice House to come by turns to his own residence to be trained in domestic duties, and almost all of them were, on the expiration of their apprenticeship, advantageously placed in service. We believe the regular employment and dispersion among *unpauper* workers, attainable by apprenticeship to manufacturers, affords a valuable outlet for workhouse children; but we are warned by the enlightened employers whose experience we have just related, that the numbers collected under one roof should be small, especially if located in a town, where many influences adverse to success are inevitable and intensify the need for individualisation.

Other manufacturers who have, at various times and in various ways, employed pauper apprentices, have likewise striven to secure their welfare, and have generally succeeded

when taking a personal interest, and exercising a constant watchfulness. But on the whole the verdict, at least in the more recent experiments, appears to be against the plan, not so much from failure on the side of the children, as in some cases from their low standard of health, and from the anxiety and responsibility thrown upon highly conscientious employers by the children being dependent on them. The present conditions of the labour market have, moreover, so revolutionised the system of apprenticeship, that it seems probable it will soon be superseded. The demands of the Education Act, even when lightened for factory workers, have made it almost impossible for young children to gain a thorough industrial training in a workshop, except perhaps those destined for special mill-work, who have to learn while their fingers are still growing and flexible. Many of the half-timers to be met with in the factories now go there to earn a small wage by waiting on the 'hands,' and performing other offices of unskilled labour, rather than to acquire technical skill.

The Guardians at Manchester, however, still apprentice boys of thirteen and fourteen as colliers, under a particular indenture, not to the owners of the collieries, but to the workmen, who seem to become to some extent the boys' foster-fathers. By the form of agreement the man promises to provide his apprentice with 'competent and sufficient meat, drink, wearing apparel, lodging, and washing, and all other things fit for his station and degree as such servant as aforesaid.' He also pays him a sum of not less than fourpence per week the first year of service, eightpence the second, and a shilling the third year; one half of the allowance for the second and third years to be reserved for the boy's use at the expiration of his term of service. The apprenticeship is for three years, and during that time the employer is bound to allow the boy to be visited twice a year by an officer sent by the Guardians; to inform them in case of serious disease or sickness; and to cause the boy to attend Divine Worship and Sunday School if within a reasonable distance. Boys are apprenticed to colliery work from Liverpool also, and probably from other large towns.

We hear of lads from Ashton union being thus placed near Wakefield; twenty-two employed in coal-mines, one on a farm, and another as an oatcake baker. 'They all appeared healthy and robust, were contented, and showed a decided disinclination to go back to the workhouse. They had no complaints to make, and the foster-parents made none.' We quote from a report made to their Board by the Master and Matron of Ashton workhouse after a visit of inspection.[1] The Guardians of West Derby union sent their boys many years ago to exactly the same district, where we believe they were equally well-treated. It is a pretty rural neighbourhood, and said to afford good homes. The lads are spoken of as 'boarded-out;' but this is not strictly correct, as they are placed out at an age far above the limit fixed by the Boarding-out Order.

[1] *Ashton Standard*, September 29th, 1888.

CHAPTER V

BOARDING-OUT IN IRELAND AND SCOTLAND

'He setteth the solitary in families.'

'And some were orphans, and athirst
For sweet home love.'—E. H. EXON.

IT may seem superfluous to insist on the truth that institutions and systems have no *raison d'être* but the benefit of those for whose sake they were originally planned. Yet experience shows that this obvious truth is constantly ignored, and schemes and establishments prized for themselves, especially by those interested in their working, and who have taken an active share in their organisation, but who may be, nevertheless, comparatively ignorant of, or even indifferent to, the final result.

This proposition is markedly exemplified in pauper institutions, but it is only those for the young with which we are concerned. Fascinated by the aspect of a powerful organisation dealing with great numbers, the children exist for the sake of the institution in the class of minds of which we speak. They cannot doubt the wisdom and efficacy of arrangements which have cost much trouble and vast funds, and have been planned with exquisite precision; and they overlook that unknown quantity, human nature, which must be allowed for in all these problems, and is apt to assert itself somewhat disastrously if left out of the reckoning. Child-nature was certainly little recognised in the organisation of our big pauper schools, and so it came to pass that some more natural methods of training them have been suggested by those not only interested in their

welfare but comprehending their needs. It was to this latter order of minds clearly necessary to restore the children as far as possible to those conditions under which all ought to be brought up, to obtain for them the care of motherly and fatherly people, who as foster-parents would replace those they had lost, and under whose charge they would share the wholesome family influences which afford the best training for a good and independent life. Only under such an arrangement would the demoralising and pauperising effects of training under the Poor Law be nullified and the hereditary taint of pauperism stamped out. The plan is not an invention of modern philanthropy, as is often supposed; it is the old method of fosterage which has always prevailed more or less probably throughout the world, but which appears to have died out in England, owing possibly to our Poor Law, while still actively recognised in some form or other among all the other nations of Europe.

It seems anomalous that this family method of dealing with the children of the State should not have retained public favour among the English, who are in the habit of boasting almost arrogantly of their domestic virtues and love of home. Perhaps one reason (among others which will be discussed farther on) may be that when this method has been revived more than once among us, and especially when brought prominently forward some twenty years ago as Boarding-out, it was erroneously confounded with the *Farming-out* of pauper children to contractors. This practice arose in the last century, being adopted as giving, it was supposed, an easy means of supervision; but this supervision does not seem to have been practised. Evils crept into some of these establishments, due sometimes to the greed and harshness of the conductors, but more often probably to their ignorance of sanitary laws, and of the especial danger to life of massing young children together. The suffering thus produced culminated about forty years ago at the establishment of a contractor named Drouet, in a terrible mortality which sent a shock of horror and remorse through the nation, and caused, it is believed, the

death of Mr. Drouet himself from grief. But his establishment was practically a district school, and therefore diametrically opposed in principle to Boarding-out, which aims at separating hundreds into units, and whose motto is individual treatment.

Boarding-out, in the form of fosterage, has existed in Ireland from time immemorial. The strong family ties and loving affectionate nature of her people are peculiarly favourable to its success. So strong indeed was the tie between foster-parent and child known to be, that in Edward III.'s reign an Act was passed prohibiting the Irish from receiving English foster-children. It was the invader's policy to keep the races from mingling. How different might the history of Ireland have been had the mutual affection engendered by fosterage been allowed to bring them together.

The Protestant Charter Schools of Ireland, founded early in the eighteenth century, received the children of that faith who were cast upon the public bounty for maintenance until the report of the Irish Education Inquiry Commission of 1825 exposed so discreditable a state of things—akin to that discovered some years later to prevail in the Edinburgh Hospitals—that public aid was shortly afterwards withdrawn from them, and as asylums they ceased, in 1828, to exist. To their abolition is due the existence of boarding-out, in the form known to us. A touching incident marks its origin as now organised in these islands. In that same year, 1828, three Protestant working men of Dublin, returning from a friend's funeral, consulted how they could best provide for and bring up his orphan children since the accustomed refuge of the Charter Schools was no longer available.[1] Bereaved little ones might indeed obtain

[1] 'Paper on the Importance of Substituting the Family System of Rearing Orphan Children for the System now pursued in our Workhouses,' by W. Neilson Hancock, LL.D. [Read before the Social Inquiry Society of Ireland, January 8th, 1859.] This paper, together with notes upon it by John O'Hagan, Esq. (afterwards Lord O'Hagan, the late Lord Chancellor of Ireland), read before the Society on the 28th of the same month, presents a mass of interesting evidence on the superiority of the family over the school system in bringing up pauper children.

entrance to Roman Catholic orphanages, but in these, not unnaturally, conversion to the creed of their benefactors became, if not actually a condition, generally a consequence of the children's admittance. To avoid such a result for the offspring of their dead friend the men conceived the idea whence sprang the Protestant Orphan Society, which, in the course of years, has, with its auxiliaries, spread its roots far over half Ireland. A 'penny a week' subscription was set on foot by the suggesters of the scheme (in Ireland a common and, as it appears to us, a touching mode among the poor of raising funds for charitable purposes), and with the humble sum of threepence they began to plan their work in November 1828, little dreaming the growth to which it was destined. Difficulties at first seeming almost insuperable were surmounted by energy and perseverance, money flowed in apace, a society was formed of which the then Archbishop of Dublin became patron, the Provost of Trinity and the Dean of S. Patrick's accepting the office of vice-presidents. Other destitute orphans in addition to those for whom the scheme was primarily devised were selected as the first recipients of its bounty, and the plan was adopted for training its wards which has ever since been pursued. No vast and imposing building was erected to swallow up the funds and to agglomerate the children in unnatural masses, but the orphans were placed at board in the families of respectable members of their own faith, usually labourers or small farmers. The character of the foster-mother or 'nurse,' as she is called, was duly ascertained, and she was required to produce a certificate, attested by the minister of the parish and the nearest resident magistrate, not only as to the essential points of morality and sobriety, but as to the suitability of her house and family, and the possession of one or more cows. Subsequently the churchwarden's attestation was also required, and it was made a condition that the nurse should not receive children from the Foundling Hospital or any other charitable institution.

Inspectors were appointed by the Society to verify the statements of the certificates, to visit the homes from

time to time, and to investigate the treatment and progress of the children both at home and in school, filling up elaborate forms with the results of their observations. The reports are filed at the office of the Society, constituting a history of each child which can be referred to at any moment.

As a further safeguard the supervision is obtained of the Protestant clergyman of the district in which the children are located; he is in constant correspondence with the central committee of the Society, and occasional visits are made by appointed members of the committee itself.

It may readily be believed that by the means we have described effective protection against ill-treatment is afforded to the orphans, for though occasionally it is found necessary to reprove a foster-mother and sometimes, though very rarely, to withdraw the children from her care, a constant though unobtrusive watch prevents any wrong towards the little ones being continued. The nurses are required to present themselves and their wards at the annual meetings of the Society (their travelling expenses being defrayed), and to produce a certificate from their clergyman that the children regularly attend a Protestant place of worship, and day and Sunday schools. A reward to the teacher, if the child, on leaving school, is found to have been well instructed, secures his interest in its progress, while the regular attendance of the little orphans enables them to carry off a large share of the prizes.

The sums paid by the Society to the nurses were originally £4 per annum for children under two, and £3 : 10s. for all above that age. This was to cover the expense of food, lodging, washing, and education, the Society providing clothing. Subsequently these amounts were raised to £5 for children under one year old and £4 for all above; the Society paying 5s. per annum to a neighbouring school for each child able to attend.

Many of the subscribers wished, when the Association was formed, that a house should be taken as a dwelling for the orphans; and consequently a very careful investigation was made into the relative merits of the two plans. The

inquiry resulted in the conviction that the cost of the children maintained in a house apart would be three times that of their support in families, while the moral advantage of replacing them as nearly as possible in the circumstances appointed by Nature was believed to afford an equally strong motive for adopting the Boarding-out system.

The annual cost of the children (exclusive of apprenticeship fees) is between £10 and £11 per head, dividing the whole expenditure of the Society by the number of its wards. We know that in England the friends of an orphan have sometimes to lay out £100 (in purchasing votes, etc.) simply to obtain its election to one of our asylums, —a sum which, if expended on the plan of the Dublin society, would probably maintain the child until able to support itself.

In 1832 branch associations began to be formed in provincial towns, which have proved equally successful with the original institution. In 1836 a home for the elder children was opened in Dublin that they might receive instruction superior to that given in country schools, six boys and six girls being received in it at a time, and vacancies filled up as they occur. Here they are well taught in neighbouring schools, and the girls are practised in a higher class of housework than is attainable in a cottage dwelling; the clothing for all the orphans is stored here, and the house affords a home for the nurses and their wards on the annual visit to Dublin.

All the children placed out by the Society are apprenticed, the boys for five or seven years to trades, the girls for three or five years to trades or domestic service, and thus a certain degree of control is maintained over them during youth. A fee, graduated according to circumstances, is given with each child apprenticed to a *trade*. Great care has always been exercised in the selection of employers, and an inspector is appointed to visit every apprentice twice yearly and to keep up a constant intercourse by letter. An Apprentice Relief fund was formed in 1842 to afford assistance in cases of extreme need, where the apprenticeship has been faithfully served.

Eighteen or twenty years ago £2000 were left by Joseph Kinsey for providing marriage-portions for orphans reared by the Society. The amount fixed is £40 for a male, and £30 for a female orphan; and from time to time these sums are awarded under the appointed conditions, which include that of the applicant being a proper object for the grant. If in the same year more applications are made than the fund will meet, it is the duty of the Committee to select the most deserving.

A severe test of the excellence of any system for the up-bringing of children is that of the rate of mortality of its wards; for as this is high or low, so usually will be the general health, and where the physical health of children is high, so pretty certainly will be their moral welfare. The mortality of the wards of this Society, calculated in 1862 upon several preceding years by the eminent statistician the late Dr. Neilson Hancock, was slightly under 1 per cent per annum, the average national rate for their age being about 1½ per cent.[1] He used it as a standard of comparison with the mortality of workhouse children, with which we shall soon have to deal.

The Protestant Orphan Society has now a record of sixty years, and appears in no way to have lost vigour or diminished in success. From a late Report we learn that it has thirty-four branches, numbers 193 children under its care, and has started 2781 young persons on a useful career. The reports do not afford minute statistics of moral results, partly no doubt because the children, as they establish themselves in life, are gradually lost sight of; but careful and extensive inquiry, both from those engaged in this benevolent enterprise and from disinterested observers, seems to prove that the results are not less satisfactory under a moral than under a sanitary or pecuniary point of view.

The careful organisation of this Society, to which its success is doubtless largely owing, has special interest for the advocates of Boarding-out as now pursued for our State children. It was accepted as an example by

[1] *The Mortality of Children in Workhouses in Ireland*, by W. Neilson Hancock, LL.D. Dublin, 1862.

Mr. Greig[1] when more than 40 years ago he remodelled the system for the city parish of Edinburgh; and its main features are reproduced in the English Boarding-out Orders of 1870 and 1877.

A similar Orphanage Society, called St. Brigid's, was established in Dublin thirty years ago by a Roman Catholic lady for children of that faith who had been left destitute. Placed to board in respectable country families, they are constantly watched over by the priest of the parish in which they dwell, and visited by the conductors of the Orphanage (a term which in this case does not imply any building), who also periodically examine the children and give prizes to the foster-mothers of 10s. for each child that proves to have been kept up to the standard appointed by the managers.[2] At a suitable age they are apprenticed to trades or service. A letter dated 1872, from a lady well acquainted with this charity, states that by that time upwards of 700 children had been reared in country homes, and were out in the world. They did not seem so 'accomplished' as when brought up in orphanages, but were handy and healthy, even if sickly when first placed out. More homes offered than there were orphans to put in them. The children had obtained industrious, self-reliant habits, and were almost invariably getting on well. Their cost while boarded out did not exceed £7 a year, and nearly one half had been adopted by their foster-parents, who were chiefly small farmers.

In cases of neglect, which the writer says are very rare, the orphan is removed to another home; but to have a child thus taken away is dreaded by foster-parents.[3] This dread of losing the children even from circumstances involving no blame, the abundance of good homes exceeding the demand, and frequency of adoption, are now familiar facts to workers in Boarding-out; yet the strength of the affection which grows up between foster-parent and child is still far from

[1] Mr. George Greig, Inspector to the City Parish of Edinburgh (an office analogous to that of Clerk to the Guardians in England, with some additional duties and powers), and a high authority on Boarding-out.

[2] *Irish Homes and Irish Hearts*, by Fanny Taylor. London: Longmans, 1867.

[3] *The Lamp*, No. 123.

being generally understood. The experience of St. Brigid's affords many touching instances. A poor man, whose wife had charge of one of the orphans, was obliged to seek employment in England. He obtained a good situation, sent for his family and charged his wife to bring the boy. 'Go,' said he, 'to St. Brigid's and tell the lady that we will make our own of the child, and that we will do for him the same as our own, and there will be no difference between them.'

The following instance is even more striking, as no possible return in the form of help from the adopted child could have been anticipated. 'A little boy after being four years on the books gave signs of idiocy; it was necessary to send him to the Union as he could not be a permanent burden on the Orphanage; but when the nurse heard of it, she said she would adopt him. "Is he of any service to you?" was asked. "What service could the poor boy be to me? But he is a loving child, and if he must be put off the books, I'll keep him, I'll be a mother to him."' Again, a strong man came with tears in his eyes to a priest to implore that a child who had been in his house might not be taken away. 'My wife will break her heart if the child be torn from us,' he said; 'leave her with us and we will make her our own.'[1]

So much in proof of the affection of the foster-parents. Here is testimony to the reciprocal feeling awakened in the hearts of the children. A lad who had been placed out to service brought his Christmas box of four shillings to the Sisters. Another, in announcing a rise in his wages, said, 'Then I can support my poor mother, and I'll pay for two of the orphans too.'

There are no establishment expenses connected with the Orphanage (which continues its good work), as the confraternities in the city collect the subscriptions, and the inspection is performed by the ladies connected with St. Brigid's.

We turn now to the condition of children in Irish Workhouses, and its amelioration by Boarding-out. Prior

[1] *Irish Homes and Irish Hearts.*

to the Irish Poor Law of 1839, grand juries of counties and cities had power to present five pounds annually for twelve years for the maintenance in suitable families of deserted infants. One only was placed in a family, and the result was that it became to all intents and purposes a member of it. When this provision was superseded by workhouses, a frightful mortality ensued.

In 1862, according to Dr. Neilson Hancock, the death rate in Irish workhouses of children under sixteen amounted to three times the national rate, while in Cork workhouse this was multiplied ten times; and in North Dublin union the mortality of children under two years amounted to 116 per annum. 'In other words, children under two years of age were not likely to live more than ten months in the house.'[1] No wonder the Guardians of that union urged the non-admission of such children, 'as it would be nearly certain death to receive them.' When a question arose as to the religion in which two deserted children should be brought up, in the North Dublin union, a member of the Board remarked, 'It was a thousand pities to lose so much time about a matter of no consequence, because every man knows that, from the system, not one of these children would be alive that day twelve months.' In consequence of alarming statements made in the Visitors' Book of Cork workhouse by the Mayor of the city (now Sir John Arnott), a special inquiry was, in 1859, instituted into the mortality of the children there. The evidence fully maintained the Mayor's statements and revealed a state of things which can only be termed heartrending. 'There are,' said a witness, '104 boys ranked as healthy. Of these two thirds *have been sick* with scrofula. There are besides these 46 in a sort of scrofulous school. To these 46 maimed and sick in school, we must add 22 in hospital. . . . The eyes of these poor children are very seriously—I fear permanently—affected, and, I conclude, from scrofula, making a total of 68 ranked as sick or diseased. Of the 46 deformed, maimed, and diseased in the Lazaretto school [*i.e.* for the scrofulous children] *only five entered diseased*, so

[1] *The Mortality of Children in Workhouses in Ireland.*

that 41 have been reduced to this pitiable condition while in the house. I find that some have been in the house over 11, some 10, some 9, some 8, some 7, some 6, some 5 years,—the average of the 46 is about 5 years. . . . I asked how many of the male children there were who had grown from childhood to manhood. I was told *sixteen!* "Here is one of them, sir." I looked in the direction pointed out, and saw in the distance (judging from his *size*) what I thought was a boy about twelve years of age. He approached, and I found he was a *man*. But how shrivelled and deformed! In the hospital a boy about twelve was brought before me, panting like a bird. I took him at the distance (judging from his face) for an old man. What a look of desolation marked that child's face! It was aged by want and sorrow. The boy was dying on his legs.'[1]

The general prevalence of scrofula struck unaccustomed visitors 'with a sense of painful horror.' . . . 'As I have said, there is scarcely one of these not diseased; but besides 115 that can move about and are not perfectly ruined, there are in an upper schoolroom 48 young creatures so stunted in growth and intellect and awfully affected, that no humane man can look upon them without the deepest compassion.' The percentage of deaths was four out of every five, or in other words eighty per cent. And yet the Report states no blame seemed to attach to any one in particular for this terrible state of things. The site of the buildings was indeed said to be unhealthy, but the interior of the house was kept very clean, no complaint was made of any one officer, no charge of intentional cruelty or neglect was formulated. But the whole organisation was evidently founded on the principle of punishment for pauperism, and a belief that life inside the workhouse should have no indulgence: the food too was insufficient in nourishment, often ill prepared, and never varied, and to this and the unnatural system of confinement the excessive scrofula was attributed.[2]

[1] *The Investigation into the Condition of the Children in the Cork Workhouse*, by John Arnott, Esq., M.P., Mayor of Cork, Appendix. Cork: Grey Bros., 1859. [2] *Ibid.*

Horrible as was the state of things at Cork, it was, if possible, worse at Dublin. In 1856 Mr. Norwood, Guardian for North Dublin union, incited by the frightful fact that almost all the orphans and deserted children who entered the workhouse died, had moved for power to locate them with tenant farmers; but notwithstanding the impression on the public mind made by the Cork revelations, it was not until 1862 that this power was obtained. The Act then passed authorised the children remaining out of the workhouse until eight years old, raised in 1868 to ten years; and by a Bill brought in by Mr. O'Shaughnessy, further extended, in 1875, to thirteen.

The Cork Guardians lost no time in availing themselves of the power to board-out, Mr. D'Esterre Parker being a leader in the good work, and a voluntary committee of ladies co-operating with them. The saving of infant life was marvellous. A Return, dated April 1883, shows that up to that time 824 children had been placed out, of whom —some being sickly infants a few days old and picked up on doorsteps—during those twenty-one years only thirty-two had died. The 26th Annual Report of the Boarding-out Committee for Cork Union, dated August 1888, tells us that 'the total number of Children who were boarded-out since the Act was passed, from the 10th October 1862 to the 5th July 1888, was 1073.

'Of this number there were claimed by relations . .	135
Returned to Workhouse and since left, having got situations	215
Adopted by Foster-Parents	392
Died	44
At present in the Workhouse	3
Do. at Nurse	284
	1073'

In the 25th Annual Report only two deaths are recorded for the year 1887 among 257 children, and of these the Committee says apologetically, 'they were very delicate when sent out.' In the same Report it is stated that a young married woman had recently applied for children to be boarded-out with her who, on inquiry, proved to have

been herself boarded-out in 1864, and, her character and recommendations being satisfactory, two were allotted to her. It is also related that a girl who had been boarded-out and then in service, had earned enough to pay her passage ten years ago to America, and had since sent £20 to her foster-father, besides defraying the cost of emigration for one of his children.

It has now become the rule for the foster-parents to adopt the children at thirteen, and the success generally of the plan is equal, we believe, to any attained elsewhere, alike in its moral results and in launching the young people in an honest and industrious life. None, we are told, have been known ever to return to the workhouse, except in cases of illness, and they quit it as soon as they can. It is, then, no wonder that the Cork Guardians desire authority to board-out *all* the children who come into their care. Two years ago they presented a petition to Parliament, which, after stating the beneficial results attained with orphans and deserteds, prayed 'to have the Act amended by extending its salutary provisions to any workhouse child whom a Board of guardians should think fit to be sent out to nurse.' No favourable response has yet been made, but we hope other Boards throughout the Kingdom who can speak from like experience, will support the prayer of the Cork Guardians, and win the consent of Parliament to the widest practicable extension of the system.

On the 30th June 1888, 105 of the 163 Irish Unions had adopted Boarding-out, the number of orphan and deserted children so dealt with being 2694, about one quarter, we believe, of the juvenile paupers of Ireland. Generally the plan is managed by a committee of Guardians (with the help of the relieving officer who acts as their inspector), and when these take interest in the work the children fare well. The Local Government Board for Ireland issued a Boarding-out Order in 1876, very similar to those of the English Department, but unhappily not encouraging the help of voluntary committees; and the necessary active interest of the Guardians has sometimes been wanting, with deplorable consequences, though in a

few unions only has the children's lot been as sad as within workhouse walls. To aid in securing due care for them, ladies have, in some places, been invited to form committees like that at Cork, to recommend homes and visit the children; but they are needed everywhere. Cork may be taken as a model, and there is no reason why, if the same means are employed, the same success should not be obtained.

A year ago the Matron of the South Dublin union, from which about 100 children are boarded-out, informed us that though she greatly approved the plan, and had a horror of children being brought up in the Workhouse, she yet saw many difficulties in securing good homes and suitable training; nor was she satisfied with the inspection. She earnestly wished for certified Committees, to whom responsibility could be entrusted, and who might indirectly remedy what was unsatisfactory by refusing the children to those whose cottages were not suitable. Much good would thus incidentally be effected in raising the standard of comfort of the poor, and practically bringing home to them the advantage of cleanliness and sanitary conditions. The country which gave to Scotland and England the best model for Boarding-out, will not, we trust, allow herself to fall back in the race.

Boarding-out was years ago a necessity in a large proportion of Scottish parishes, from the non-existence of workhouses; but in most it existed simply as out-relief, without special supervision or other care for the welfare of the children, and so in some parishes it remains even now. In 1846, however, poorhouses, as they are called, were built in various parts of the country, and the children were removed into them; but it is significant that, after a trial, some of these were speedily put out again. The increasing feeling in Scotland, to which we have already referred, against 'hospitals,' has in many instances, on reports in favour of like institutions for pauper children being presented, caused Poor law guardians to abandon the idea and abide by boarding-out. The children thus dealt with are

classified as orphans, deserted, and separated, the latter being the offspring of either paupers in the poorhouse, or of persons maintaining themselves outside, whose consent, however, to their being thus disposed of is required by law.

Even the ins and outs, whose treatment is in England, as we have seen, so perplexing a problem, are in some parishes boarded-out if there is a probability of the parents not claiming them under several weeks. The number of children boarded-out classed as 'separates' is, however, comparatively small. It was in the last Official Return, dated May 14th, 1888, given as 635, the whole number boarded-out being 5082.

The Scottish Poor Law leaves wider discretion to boards of guardians than we are accustomed to in England, and to rescue a child from its parents' influence, when that is notoriously evil, it is sometimes dispatched to a foster-home far away; and though the authorities are compelled to restore it if the parents demand it, often this is avoided, and the child grows up honest and industrious. The knowledge that children will be thus dealt with, instead of encouraging desertion, deters from it, as Scottish parents as well as English do not like to lose the power of reclaiming possession of their offspring. Indeed it happens sometimes that the desire to regain them will bring about the reform of the parent. Thus, 'I have returned the children,' says Mr. Greig, 'to sober mothers and a clean comfortable home.' A recent decision of the Supreme Court of Scotland has strengthened the hands of those who are striving to protect children from evil parents. A lady, who has an Emigration Training Home, had had a child entrusted to her by its father, and after a time she sent it to Canada. The father instituted an action for its recovery, but the Court having received conclusive evidence that both father and mother were thoroughly drunken and demoralised, refused to grant an order, on the ground 'that the child, if given up to them, would be destroyed, both body and soul.'

The success of Scotland in boarding-out the children of the State has become proverbial. We quote the

following Report, drawn up by Mr. Greig in 1864, as giving, in an admirably condensed form, the principles of the Scheme, and a narrative of the methods by which it has been carried into effect, chiefly modelled by him upon those devised by the Irish Protestant Orphan Society.

'The pauper children of this parish were formerly maintained in an institution, called the Orphan Hospital, apart from the poorhouse; but so dissatisfied was this Board with the results, that about eighteen years ago they resolved to board the children with families in the country, where they might have the physical advantage of the country air, as well as the moral one of being separated from bad associates and brought into contact with people of good character. This plan has since been followed by all the larger parishes in Scotland. . . . With the view of securing proper supervision in carrying out the family system, this Board appointed an assistant to the inspector, whose sole duty it is to superintend the children boarded-out, both boys and girls, and to find out good nurses for them. ["Nurse" is the term applied in Scotland as in Ireland to the foster-mother.] They are boarded with cottagers, farm-servants, or tradespeople, and not with persons who make the care of them their only task.

'Preference is given to people of character who have a steady income apart from the allowance for the board of the children, and who will receive and treat them exactly as members of their own family; and it is found that when the children are sent out young, they learn to call the parties to whom they are sent Father and Mother. They acquire towards them the feelings of children, and the result generally is that the nurses acquire for them a parental affection.' The assistant inspector visits the nurse as well as the school at least eight times in the year, satisfies himself that the children are healthy, sufficiently fed, kept cleanly, and that their education is attended to; and in addition, the Inspector and members of the Board, in rotation, visit the whole of the children boarded out once a year. 'People of excellent moral character are generally got to take charge of the children,

but should inferior persons be, perchance, selected, the close superintendence prevents them from doing injustice. Should neglect occur in any case, however, the children are at once removed, but although there are about 300 children boarded-out, and, some years ago, there were 400, I have only had occasion to remove children, in consequence of neglect on the part of their nurses, on three or four occasions during a period of five years.' After describing the regulations for insuring school attendance, the report continues, 'It is a rare thing for either a boy or a girl, who has been brought up by the Parochial Board in this way, to become chargeable to the parish in after life, which was not the case as to the children who were brought up in the hospital in town.' Before attendance at school was compulsory the regular attendance of these children often made them the best scholars, so that they took a great number of prizes. In the report by the late Mr. Adamson, inspector for the City Parish of Glasgow, quoted by Mr. Greig, we find that the most friendly feelings exist between children and foster-parents.

'With the view of extending the benefits of the domestic influence on the children beyond the period when the Board has charge of them, we get the nurses to find apprenticeships for the boys and service for the girls, as much as possible with employers in their own neighbourhood, so that the children may have the opportunity of visiting their nurses on the Saturday afternoons, or at other times when they get liberty, and in these cases the nurse continues her care over them, and washes and mends their clothes when necessary, for which they remunerate her. On such visits the children are received with friendly welcome, as if it were their home, and they thus contract the habit of returning to it at intervals, assured of meeting with advice in difficulties, sympathy in distress, and heartfelt congratulations on success. In the event of a boy or girl having to leave their service, through sickness, or otherwise, they return to their nurse's house, and are often supported there for months without any remuneration ever being asked from the Board. Should the nurse, however,

not be in a position to do this, or wish assistance, the Board readily grants it; but this is seldom asked. Many cases have come to my knowledge where the child has, in after life, contributed to the support of the nurse.

'The children are sent to board at all ages; *but the younger they are sent so much the better.* If sent when at the breast, the nurse cannot help having a strong affection for them. In those cases where the children are ten or eleven years of age before they have come on the parish, and whose previous training has been vicious, the same good result cannot be looked for; still, it is found that a religious education, kindness, and the moral influence of their new friends and associates, do much for them. Cases have occurred where such have acted well so long as under these influences, but on return to town and meeting old friends have fallen back into their old habits; hence, this class are sent to the most distant localities, and situations found for them in the district, if possible, so that they may not be again brought into contact with their old associates. The children thus brought up are not only well educated, but understand and can discharge the various duties in a household, which children brought up in school or hospital know nothing of; hence, our children are preferred as servants and apprentices to the children brought up in the various hospitals in the city at a cost of as much as £50 a year each.[1]

'We are still compelled to have a number of children

[1] Elsewhere Mr. Greig says, 'A gasfitter asked me to get him two boys to learn his trade. He had had two boys from George Heriot's Hospital —an endowed institution in Edinburgh for boys, where there are many female and male servants, the latter in livery, so that the boys are waited on by footmen. The gasfitter said that the two boys he had received from the institution would not get along at all, for they could not put up with correction by the foreman when they misbehaved; but the boys I sent him finished their time, and the master told me he never knew better boys, and that he was sure they would make prosperous men of the world.'— *Leaflet No.* 5, issued by the Association for the Advancement of Boarding-out, 22 Berners Street, London. This Association sprang from the Conference on Boarding-out, held in 1885. The Duchess of Albany (who takes an active interest in the work of a Boarding-out Committee at Esher) is its Patron, and it has for President Lord Cranbrook. Its object is to co-operate with Boards of Guardians and others in promoting Boarding-out, and in securing the welfare of the children.

in the Poorhouse, when their parents are in gaol, or in sickness, and therefore the chargeability merely casual; and amongst them we daily see the evil effects of having a large number of such children congregated together, as not only do they encourage each other in present evil, but the fact of being inmates of such a place has a debasing influence on their after life.

'In a large adjoining parish in Edinburgh, the managers [Poor law Guardians] some years ago, arranged a plan by which they personally visited the children, after they had been sent to service, and endeavoured to exercise a care over them; but it was found that the personal intercourse thus maintained by these parochial gentlemen had the effect of keeping up in the children a feeling of their connection with the parish, and a depressing consciousness of dependence, which was quite opposed to individual effort, and consequently to success in life. In fact, the blight of pauperism extended over, and deprived of beneficial influence, all these friendly communications, often well meant, and attended with no small trouble on the part of the gentlemen who engaged in it, and the plan had in consequence to be relinquished. . . . When a child is sent young to the country, or has been there for some time, and is taught to look on its nurse as its parent (I say parent, as we transact with the wife as the party having immediate charge; but the husband takes an equal interest in the child, and is equally regarded by it), and when the nurses are themselves quite independent of the parish, the child regards itself as a member of the family; its connection with the parish is neither felt nor understood, and I have often found that the only idea it had was a vague one that the assistant inspector who called so frequently had somehow some charge over it. But it had no idea that it was a pauper, and would treat with the same horror and contempt as is entertained by the respectable working-people a proposal to remove it to the workhouse. This removal of the consciousness of a state of dependence on the parish, and the engendering of a spirit of self-reliance which is cherished by the class with whom the children are brought

into contact, is a sure means of preventing them from lapsing into a state of hereditary pauperism—a result which can be obtained by no method that I am aware of but the Family system adopted by this Board.

'In adopting this system—in restoring, as it were, the lost link, and giving these poor children new parents and homes, with their sacred influences and endearing ties and associations—this Board is persuaded that they are acting in accordance with a law ordained by Him who has framed the moral government of the world; and the results obtained in the moral elevation and excellent education of the children, in adapting them for the duties they will be called on to discharge in the position of life they are likely to occupy, have been such as might have been expected from a plan thus solemnly sanctioned.'

We would draw especial attention to Mr. Greig's remark, that the earlier the children are boarded-out the better. In one of Thomas Hood's wise and witty sayings, he speaks of the importance and value of 'impressions before letters,' and there is no doubt that the surroundings of infancy affect the bent of a child's mind very strongly, even before any direct teaching can be given. Besides, as Mr. Greig points out, a foster-mother feels a more tender affection for a child she has reared as a baby, and she would not have to correct bad habits formed through negligence; while as regards the all-important question of bodily health, the children should be put out as young as possible, being far less likely to develop a scrofulous habit of body with variety of food and an outdoor life than with the monotonous diet and in the close wards of a workhouse.

Those who originate a plan and carry it into effect can hardly be accepted as impartial witnesses, and it is well when outside testimony also can be studied. The late Dr. Browne, Commissioner in Lunacy for Scotland, who had peculiar opportunities for investigation, having had his attention drawn to the practice of Boarding-out, satisfied himself by observation and inquiry of the soundness of the plan while it was still comparatively new.

The benefit resulting from the natural cottage-life, as

compared with the artificial existence within workhouse walls, he regarded as incalculable; but the cottager class, he said, have failings, nay vices, of their own to be guarded against, and, as is now fully recognised among us, those are probably exceptional members of it who are desirable as foster-parents. Moreover, he held that closer and more constant supervision was needful than, when writing twenty years ago, was to be generally found in Scotland, though probably he would have excepted Edinburgh and Glasgow. 'To formularise my convictions,' he concluded, 'I should say that the system of boarding-out has been fairly tried, has been found satisfactory, and that if worked out and developed it is calculated to enfeeble and perhaps ultimately to eradicate the pauper tendency; but it may still be regarded as in progress, imperfect and *sub judice.*'

The crucial test of boarding-out is generally acknowledged to be the diminution of pauperism wherever it has been long and extensively practised. We find such diminution in Scotland in a marked degree. In 1859 the ratio of persons in receipt of parochial relief in proportion to population was 4 per cent. In 1875 it had decreased gradually to 3.0. Or as Mr. Skelton, Secretary to the Scottish Board of Supervision [Poor Law Board], has otherwise expressed it: 'In 1859, out of a population of about 3,000,000, there were 122,000 paupers. In 1875, out of a population of about three millions and a half, there were 105,000 only; and for the past five or six years the decrease has been steady and persistent.'[1] By 1878 the numbers had sunk below 100,000. There have been alternations since, but with a general decline, and the total number on May 14th, 1888, was 96,266, the percentage of pauperism to population being then and for the three preceding years 2.4.[2] This percentage for England and Wales was, on January 1st, 1888, 'about 3 per cent.'[3]

In comparing the tax upon the ratepayers in the two

[1] *Pauperism and the Boarding-out of Pauper Children in Scotland*, by John Skelton. Blackwood: Edinburgh, 1877.
[2] *43rd Annual Report of the Board of Supervision for Scotland*, 1888.
[3] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1887-88.

countries, Mr. Skelton says: 'In England the people annually pay seven shillings per head for the support of their poor . . . in Scotland the population per head pay four shillings and sevenpence.'[1]

He gives a very interesting comparison of expenditure in poor relief in London and Scotland, but it is too long to reproduce, and we give only his summary. 'It thus appears that (the population of London [in 1877] being barely equal to that of Scotland) the number of paupers in the Metropolis is nearly 10,000 in excess of the number in Scotland, and the amount expended exactly double the expenditure in Scotland. £800,000 sufficing for Scotland, as compared with £1,600,000 expended in London.'

The decrease of pauperism in Scotland has in a few localities reached zero. A letter from Mr. Superintendent Campbell says, 'To the parishes of Glendevon and Flisk, Aberdalgie in Perthshire has now to be added as returned without a pauper on the roll. Many other small parishes throughout the country would, I believe, be equally freed from the taint of pauperism were we able to obtain generally a firm and uniform administration of the Poor Law.'[2]

The same letter quotes the following Return supplied by Mr. Grimmond, the present Inspector of children for the City Parish of Glasgow.

'*Report as to the character, occupation, and whereabouts of those who have been struck off the City Parochial Board Roll when fit for work since May* 1872. Males 353, females 271 —total 624. Known and reported, male 308, female 233 —total 541. Of good character, male 302, female 230— total 532. Bad or unsatisfactory, male 6, female 3—total 9. Dead, male 23, female 8—total 31.' The employments are given, and some of the number have emigrated, and others married. 'I consider this a very remarkable document,' adds Mr. Campbell, 'and one which our neighbours across the border may study with advantage. Out of 624 children the after career of 541 has been traced, and out of

[1] *Pauperism, and the Boarding-out of Pauper Children in Scotland.*
[2] 42*nd Annual Report of the Board of Supervision.*

this large number 9 only have been found bad or unsatisfactory. I question if any other class of society could show a smaller average of failures. The average annual cost for each child is £11 : 11s.' Of this £7 : 14 : 8½ is for board and lodging, the other expenses coming under the different items of clothing and shoes, education, medical attendance, and management, this last being 18s.—a contrast to the heavy expenditure on salaries and establishment charges in England.

A like return for the City Parish of Edinburgh gives valuable information in detail. We draw attention to the list of occupations open to the boys, most of them being distinctly superior to those usually available for lads discharged from our large pauper schools.

'REPORT AS TO CHILDREN BOARDED IN THE COUNTRY FROM 14TH MAY 1887 TO 14TH MAY 1888.

	Boys.	Girls.	Total.
The number of children at Board (including 24 Apprentices) at 14th May 1887 was . .	126	80	206
Sent out during year	26	25	51
Total at Board during the year . . .	152	105	257
Off the Roll during the year	19	17	36
Leaving chargeable (including 24 Apprentices) at 14th May 1888	133	88	221
Of those who ceased to be chargeable during the year there were—			
Apprentices' wages sufficient to maintain . .	10	...	10
Boys sent to Farm Service	6	...	6
Girls sent to Service	...	8	8
Taken off by friends whose circumstances and character had improved	3	8	11
Died	...	1	1
	19	17	36

'The *death* mentioned was that of a girl aged *one year and three months*, who was in extremely delicate health when sent out to board two months previously.

'The trades to which the boys are apprenticed are—

Shoemakers	2	Edge Tool Makers	2
Compositor	1	Slater	1
Currier	1	Baker	1
Grocer	1	Paper Maker	1

'The nurses have all as usual discharged their duties in a kind and careful manner. A large portion of the children sent out during the year were infants in very delicate health, and their nurses manifested great kindness and attention in nursing them. With the exception of two girls who are suffering from disease of the spine, the children during the year enjoyed good health.

'The teachers continue to show their usual kind interest in the education and welfare of [the children, and I am glad to be able to report that as in former years our children occupy leading positions in their classes. One of the teachers writes: "Our Examination and Distribution of Prizes will take place at Christmas. Last Christmas the principal prize for English and Sewing was won by S. B.," one of our girls. Another writes: "We had a competition for a prize two months ago, which was gained by A. F.," one of our boys.

'On visiting a large public school lately, with the Managers, where we have one boy and two girls, we found the annual examination going on, and were informed that our boy had gained the first prize for English in his class, and that one of our girls had gained the first prize for Arithmetic in the highest class.

'G. GREIG, *Insp.*

'EDINBURGH, 14*th July* 1888.'

A Report previously quoted in relation to children boarded-out from Glasgow, tersely contrasts the effect of the large school in propagating evil with the opportunity afforded by Boarding-out for uprooting it. In following the latter plan, 'The Committee feel confident they are more likely to succeed than by congregating a great number of children in an orphanage, where one wicked bad child may be the means of corrupting many; while, in a family, under the eye of a judicious and vigilant nurse, where there are only one or two children, perhaps only one, a bad child is all but incapable of doing injury to others.'

This Report further tells us that Boarding-out has been pursued in Glasgow for upwards of a hundred years; and that, although the late chairman of the Children's Committee 'had at one time a strong feeling in favour of a large establishment where our orphans and deserted children

could be kept and properly trained, and collected all the information he could from similar institutions, both in this country and elsewhere, he never felt justified in proposing an alteration of our present system.'[1] 'I know the feeling in England in reference to boarding-out children,' Mr. Adamson wrote to Miss Joanna M. Hill in 1868, 'I shared it myself under the old *régime*, and, too, viewed with horror the idea,—but finding it practised here to a considerable extent seventeen years ago, I exerted myself to improve it as far as possible, and I now think that, under proper management and careful supervision, it is one of the best means of bringing up orphans and deserted children.'

Mr. Beattie, who was Inspector for the Barony Parish, Glasgow, relates a touching incident, illustrative of the strong attachment which grows up between the foster-parents and children. A child who had been placed to board with a woman in his district, was subsequently discovered to have its settlement in Edinburgh, whither the Parochial Board of that city directed it should be removed. The foster-mother, hearing that the child was to be taken from her, repaired in the utmost distress to Mr. Beattie, and besought him to obtain a reversal of the order. He explained that this was impossible; when, falling on her knees, the tears streaming down her cheeks, she implored him to let her keep the child as her own, without payment, for part with it she could not. And it was accordingly adopted by her.

A late Chairman of the Board of Supervision for Scotland, Sir John M'Neill, in his evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, 1869, on the Scotch Poor-law system, speaks of Boarding-out with unqualified praise. 'It was founded,' he said, 'not upon any law, but has been brought about by the exercise of influence on the parochial boards, by the good will of the boards themselves, and by the perception, in a series of years, of its great advantage to the parish.' No other system seemed

[1] *Report on the City Parish, Glasgow, Relief Rolls*, by E. Adamson, Inspector of Poor, August 1864.

so advantageous to him. To send the pauper boys to the industrial schools was to stamp them as wrong-doers, and mentioned with pride that one of their little boarded-out pauper boys had carried off the silver medal at a parish school near Lasswade.

In answer to the question as to his approval of schools attached to poorhouses, 'I would rather no child was reared in any workhouse. Every child that is brought up in a poorhouse is at heart a pauper; he has lived in an atmosphere of pauperism; he knows no other mode of life than pauperism, and on the first difficulty he encounters in the world he comes back to the poorhouse as the only home he knows.'

Nor did Sir John M'Neill approve any more of district schools. 'I want my pauper children to mix with a better class of children if I can manage it, to pick up their ideas from a better class of people. I do not want to intensify their pauper ideas by congregating them together. I want them to be as nearly on a footing with the other children in the day schools as possible.'

Mr. W. Hay, of Dundee, stated to the same Committee, 'We do not keep our children in the poorhouse; we think it a bad system; we send them all into the country and lodge them with cotters and small householders throughout the country, and strangely enough we have never seen a single child brought up in that way apply to the parish again, never one came back; it is an excellent system.' While another witness, Mr. J. Brown, stated that the proportion of failures among the Scotch boarded-out children was $3\frac{3}{4}$ per cent less than of those in public schools of any class.[1]

But probably the evidence upon Scottish boarding-out, which has had most influence with English readers is that of Mr. Henley after the thorough investigation he was, in 1869, directed by the English Poor Law Board to make,[2] 'With better food and clothing than can be obtained by those of the ordinary agricultural labourer,' he says, 'work-

[1] *Evidence before the House of Commons Committee*, 1869.

[2] *Report to the Poor Law Board on the Boarding-out of Pauper Children in Scotland*, 1870.

house children generally appear to me to feel the want of that liberty and space which are so essential to the healthy development of young life;' and later on, 'Boarded-out children certainly acquire a more robust constitution, and apparently greater mental activity, than children reared in an ordinary workhouse or poorhouse, and these two points strike at the very root of pauperism, as the majority who fall upon the rates do so from mental or physical weakness. Many, no doubt, are constitutionally affected, and in others the weakness is caused by vice, but in either case the result is the same.' And again, 'They [the boarded-out children] were certainly very free from those banes of workhouse schools dependent on low vitality, sore eyes, and eruption of the skin, to which town children are peculiarly prone, and from which neither in England nor Scotland can country workhouses be pronounced free.'

The report gives an epitome of Scottish experience in regard to placing the children with relations. The feeling of clanship is very strong, and when Boarding-out was first organised, the children were frequently left with some near relative. But these unfortunately often proved needy and vicious, and the parochial authorities are pretty nearly agreed that it constitutes a form of out-relief to the relations, leading to an increase of pauperism.[1] Nevertheless, we find Mr. Stewart of Nairn saying, 'In spite of all this, I would prefer boarding-out to the poor-house.' The Inspector of Govan states: 'Sometimes it was found that the mother purposely left the children that they might be sent to board with some relation or acquaintance already fixed by the mother, and who made immediate application to have the children handed to them, of course, for payment.' The Inspector of Dalziel 'was strongly in favour of boarding-out, though,' he alleged, 'more may accept this mode of relief than if the poorhouse was offered.'[2] This opinion is, however, exactly opposed to experience elsewhere in Scotland, and in England generally. Mr. Beattie tells us: 'In the case of deserted children boarding-out has the effect of often making the parents

[1] *Report.* [1] *Ibid.*

return and claim their children; they are satisfied as long as they know where they are, that is, in the poorhouse. . . . I consider we should have more children chargeable if we only applied the house test.'

The second objection to boarding-out with relations arises from the children's side of the question. 'They are better with strangers, who are more apt to be obedient to the Parochial Board [equivalent to the English Board of Guardians], and not to use the children for their private purposes,' says Mr. Craig, St. Cuthbert's, Edinburgh. 'We select strangers in preference to relations,' Mr. Adamson tells us, 'and we never divide brothers and sisters.' 'We infinitely prefer strangers to relations to board-out the children, and we try to divest them from local associations and their own acquaintances, so as to begin a new life,' says Mr. Beattie, Barony Parish, Glasgow. It is significant that one of the very few instances of cruelty in boarding-out in Scotland, mentioned by Mr. Henley, occurred to a child living with a drunken aunt; she nearly starved it, but the neighbours gave it food and reported the case.

On the importance of boarding-out as early as possible there is but one opinion. 'All are unanimous,' remarks Mr. Henley, 'that for the success of the system the children should be sent out at an early age. They are even sent out to the breast. It is difficult to deal with children in this way when they reach the age of nine, ten, or eleven.'[1]

In Glasgow an interesting effort was made to apply the plan to children suffering from serious disease. They were sent to the Island of Arran, as peculiarly favourable to the restoration of health, and in choosing the foster-parents the Parochial Board were careful to take only those who had no young children of their own. They found plenty of suitable accommodation, and the results were most satisfactory. The children, unable or only partially able to walk, recovered the use of their limbs, and the sickly regained health.[2] Other parishes, however, following this plan without like

[1] *Report.* [2] *Ibid.*

precaution, sent a number of diseased children to the same place for whom due accommodation had not even been secured. They were lodged with unsuitable people, and overcrowding was caused. The Duke of Hamilton, on whose property this happened, naturally forbade the further reception of such children by his tenants; though, as Mr. Dunlop Kirkwood, Inspector for Govan, remarks, 'There is sufficient accommodation on the shores of Scotland for all children who are so diseased, and in the interests of humanity they should be placed where they have at least a chance of obtaining a modicum of health.'[1]

On the choice of homes and inspection, Mr. Henley gives valuable information. There is apparently no voluntary help given in Scotland in selecting the homes; and inspection is conducted by the Parochial Boards and their officers. Experience in different parts of the country has led to certain unwritten rules being generally observed, as, for instance, not placing the children with any one receiving parish relief, or with relations, or any persons having no other means of subsistence than profit from the children. The Inspectors say they take every means of ascertaining the character of the foster-parents, and the condition of the house by personal inspection. There are districts, however, where inspection must be rare, owing to long distances and difficulty of access, but 'we find ourselves admirably assisted,' they say, 'by the resident clergymen of all denominations and by the [local] parochial officers and teachers generally, and in any little village, where no person of this class is resident, there is always some respectable inhabitant who is able and willing to supply us with information in the event of any of our children being neglected or ill-used.'[2] Still it seems to us that in such cases supervision must be rather chancy, and as a fact Mr. Henley saw children who had been shamefully neglected, and found that in some outlying places inspection was merely nominal, in one case no visit having been paid for four months, though one of the children was suffering from a long illness. He quotes also several instances of want of regular super-

[1] *Report.* [2] *Ibid.*

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

vision in the case of children boarded-out beyond the legal radius of the parochial inspector. But it must not be forgotten that the small holders or crofters of these more remote localities offer peculiarly eligible homes, especially for boys who are useful on the farm, and after such training easily obtain agricultural employment. 'Where,' says Mr. Henley, speaking of the crofters, 'they cannot readily find a market for their milk, they always have within their houses the best food for children, milk, meal, and potatoes. The quarterly or monthly payments for the children in cash must, in such cases, be almost a clear gain; the little services of the children in the house or the garden, or about the pigs, fowls, and cows, compensating for the troubles of washing, mending clothes, etc.'[1] The benevolent and sagacious Sheriff Watson of Aberdeen heartily approved of Boarding-out, but he thought a committee of ladies was wanted to complete the machinery for supervision—by which admirable homes like those here described may be utilised without fear.

The objection to boarding children out in a parish not their own, which would arise from their obtaining a settlement there, is practically obviated in Scotland, and Mr. Henley points out the necessity of guarding against the danger in England. This was effectually done in our Boarding-out Order of 1870, framed in the light of his experience.

The Scotch count confidently on the affection between foster-parents and children as a safeguard against ill-treatment, and many touching instances may be quoted in its justification. An old man bidding farewell to his foster-son, unable to control his tears, said, 'Well, well! John, it is no doubt for your good you are going to work, but it is sore to part with you'; and it is no uncommon occurrence to see children crying bitterly when taken from the strangers with whom they were boarded to be returned to their own parents.[2] 'A most respectable elderly woman,' Mr. Henley cites an inspector as saying, 'has brought up several children for us, and those who have left her to earn their own

[1] *Report.* [2] *Ibid.*

bread look upon her as a mother, and when they have a day to spare they return to her house as to a home. No system of massing is ever likely to produce kindred results.'[1]

It is chiefly by the results as shown in the after life of the children that different systems must be tested—the balance of evidence in Mr. Henley's Report is extraordinarily in favour of Boarding-out, as producing hard working, independent men and women whose connection with pauperism is wholly severed. The evidence of Mr. Macleod, Governor of Old Machar Poorhouse, Aberdeen, is very valuable on this point. 'I was formerly Governor of Falkirk Poorhouse; we generally had about 60 or 70 children in that house; I was not satisfied with the system, the children returned upon us. The children rarely did well in after life; they had no spirit, and knew nothing about battling with the world.'[2] Compare this with the words of Mr. D. Kemp, Governor of the City Poorhouse, Edinburgh. 'The proof of the complete success of this scheme to my mind lies in this, that the children do not come back upon our hands, but melt away among the working population.'[3] Mr. R. Robertson, Inspector of Abbey Parish, Paisley, states: 'We used to keep the children in the poorhouse, but we found it did not answer; they had a low grovelling spirit, and came back.'[4] 'I can only speak of the future career of the children—contrasting those boarded-out with those brought up in the poorhouse—and with their after demands upon myself,' says the Inspector of Govan, 'and I find that for every one in good health who returns to pauperism after being boarded-out, at least ten of those who were trained in the workhouse do.' While the Inspector of Midcalder says: 'I think it redeems the children. I have access to the old parochial books, and I have observed that pauperism is hereditary, and therefore I look upon the separation from the parents as the best means of preventing it.' Abundant evidence to the same effect is given by other inspectors.

Most conclusive also, in favour of the system, is the experience of the manager of the children in the Hospital

[1] *Report.* [2] *Ibid.*, Appendix. [3] *Ibid.* [4] *Ibid.*

[Poorhouse] at Paisley. The reasons which led them to board-out the children, viz., the unwholesome influences, both moral and physical, which surrounded them in the Hospital, have already been stated (p. 60). In the earliest report, dated as far back as 1839, the committee appointed to visit the children boarded-out from the Hospital say, 'If their advantages in this matter [*i.e.* of school teaching] are inferior to those they enjoyed in the Hospital, they are at least equal to such as are possessed by the families of ordinary tradesmen;' and concluded their report by remarking that in their opinion, 'The children are now more comfortable, healthier, and happier than they would have been had they remained in the Hospital.' A report, also from Paisley, for 1866 says—

'In regard to diet and general domestic treatment, there did not appear to be any difference made between our children and their own families [*i.e.* of foster-parents]. Two years ago, when the Board had under consideration a proposal from the Board of Supervision for altering our present system, and placing pauper children in orphanages, it was judged inexpedient to make any change. The present inspection leads this committee to the same result. We believe that children brought up in public institutions, when at length turned out into the world, are, as a general rule, feeble in body and mind, and less able to fight their way through life than those who come from the common walks of society.' The Report for 1869 says, 'The nurses, especially those who have been long employed, continue to take a lively interest in finding out suitable places for their boys and girls on their coming of age, and in keeping up a friendly intercourse with them afterwards. In reply to our inquiries, we received very gratifying accounts of the present condition and success of many who have long ceased to be chargeable.'[1]

On the point we have now to notice, it would seem that Poor Law regulations in Scotland are less rigid, and, we should say, in the long run more economical, than in England. We quote Mr. Henley: 'The children usually

[1] *Report*, Appendix.

cease to be chargeable about 13 or 14 years of age, the precise period depending on their physical condition. Their earnings are occasionally supplemented, as they require more food when they commence labour, and at that period their wages are not sufficient to support them. This payment usually ceases when they receive 5s. a week from their work.'[1] 'Parishes which do not board-out their children, such as Falkirk, Hamilton, and others, send a part of their children to work, allowing them to use the poorhouse for a lodging, and in some cases maintaining them. Their earnings are in these cases wholly or in part retained by the parish. In Falkirk, when the wages exceed their maintenance, the committee put the excess into a savings bank for the children.'[2] The practice here described resembles that at Norwich already related, but which had to be abandoned as contravening English Poor Law regulations.

Mr. Henley's summary was decidedly in favour of Boarding-out, while pointing out the risks to be avoided. His first of a series of conclusions is 'that the system as conducted by the large City Parochial Boards generally, tends to improve the children physically and mentally, and effectually breaks their connection with the poorhouse,' and subsequent ones show that, if properly carried into effect, it is preferable to the provision for children in Scotch poorhouses, that the children's education is carefully attended to, and that the foster-parents are sufficiently paid. The payment is, he says, 'sometimes as low as 2s. a week, but is usually 2s. 6d. a week. The parish also supplies clothing, and pays for schooling, medical attendance, and medical extras. There are, of course, also the expenses of supervision and of conveyance to and from the place of residence. In some cases higher fees are paid to the nurses; thus Glasgow City Parish pays 3s. for children under three years of age, and Govan for children at the breast 5s. a week, and for older children, if in delicate health, 3s. 6d. a week.'[3]

On what may be called the family aspect of the

[1] *Report*, p. 29. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Report.*

question, Mr. Henley had already given full evidence, and as his summary was intended to be of a purely practical character, there was no necessity to dwell on it farther; incidentally, however, he speaks of the boarded-out children being recognised as members of the families in which they were placed. In evident anticipation of the plan being adopted in England, he gives valuable hints which form the basis of many of our existing boarding-out regulations. One of these hints, however, has not been so fully appreciated as it should have been; that, namely, of the importance of boarding children out as young as possible. But this matter is now under the consideration of the Local Government Board, and we trust that the value of Scottish experience will be recognised in its decision.

The whole of Mr. Henley's Report is of the utmost value to the safe development of Boarding-out, full of facts and evidence of which the accuracy cannot be disputed.

CHAPTER VI

BOARDING-OUT IN ENGLAND

'It is the link of home, which is the centre of all good influences in this country; and when you have created that, you have created a new centre of love, and morality, and of hope.'—LORD CRANBROOK.

'"If it hadn't been for you," said Eppie, "they'd have taken me to the workhouse, and there'd have been nobody to love me."'—GEORGE ELIOT.

THE persons to whom probably may be attributed the revival of Boarding-out in England, are the late Mr. Armitstead of Sandbach, the Guardians of Leominster Union, and Mrs. Archer of Kingsdowne House, Wiltshire. We say 'probably,' because from time to time instances have come to our knowledge, of boarding-out springing up indigenously under the fostering care of various originators, each often ignorant of the labours of the others, so that it is impossible to say positively where its revival began. Mrs. Archer started boarding-out now many years ago, when she was applied to by a friend interested in an orphan of respectable working-people, for whom she was anxious to provide. Mrs. Archer found a home for her in the family of a cottager in her own village, the friend paying the expenses. The success of the arrangement suggested a method of befriending the class of orphan girls, for whom, as the wife of an *ex officio* Guardian, for many years chairman of the Highworth and Swindon Board, she often had her sympathy aroused. In 1861 Mrs. Archer published a pamphlet setting forth her scheme.[1] Addressing her fellow-countrywomen, she proposed that

[1] *A Scheme for Befriending Orphan Pauper Girls*, Hannah Archer. Longmans, 1861.

as many as were able should form themselves in each union into a Society for the supervision of orphan girls in the receipt of out-door relief. 'It is not,' she says, 'that the little girls in the workhouses are not fed and clothed properly, or that they have not a proper amount of school-teaching, about which I am now raising a question; but I would wish it to be understood that under the workhouse system of bringing them up their minds are contracted and their affections stifled to such a degree that they are unfitted for being placed out in those situations of life where they would be likely to make a favourable impression, and gain the goodwill of respectable employers. To remedy this evil I would propose that we should use our influence with Guardians to get all such children placed with trustworthy cottagers under whose care they may have the same advantages as other children, and the opportunity of gaining a proper knowledge of life before being thrown on their own resources.' Attendance at a good elementary school was made part of the plan.

Previous to issuing the pamphlet, Mrs. Archer had ascertained that the number of children then in Wiltshire who might be thus dealt with was about 200, while there were nearly 48,000 houses in the county. Assuming half of these to belong to persons above the labouring class, there would still be considerably more than a hundred households from among which to select a suitable home for each child needing it. This fact, she trusted, would sufficiently refute the objection that appropriate cottages cannot be found. She was not then aware that the plan she was suggesting had already, for many years, been in operation on a large scale in Scotland and Ireland, and that in both countries homes were more abundant than children.

In the same year, 1861, Mrs. Archer obtained permission in her own Union to try the plan, the Guardians granting two shillings a week for board and lodging (afterwards increased to 3s.), and ten and sixpence a quarter for clothing.[1] These sums did not cover all expenses, but

[1] 50s. is granted for an outfit on leaving the workhouse, and again for service.

Mrs. Archer trusted to a portion of the cost being met by gifts, regarding the union of voluntary effort with State aid an important feature of the plan.

It had not long been pursued at Highworth and Swindon when it was brought by Mr. Hawley, Inspector for that District, under the notice of the Poor Law Board, who, in December 1865, requested the Guardians to inform them of the circumstances which had led to its adoption. Their answer was as follows:—'Dec. 20th, 1865.—As regards your inquiry respecting orphan pauper children, we beg to state that this Board has observed with very great regret that the orphan pauper girls who have been brought up in the workhouse have, as a rule, turned out badly, seldom remaining in the situations provided for them by the Guardians and others who have taken an interest in them; and in great numbers of instances returning to the house abandoned women with bastards. In consequence of this the Guardians, after giving the subject a great deal of thought and consideration, unanimously determined to give out-door relief to orphan girls in cases where respectable cottagers could be found to take charge of them. The children thus having the same home-life and training as other cottage children, it is hoped that a better state of things might be brought about. The Board beg to observe that in no case have they relieved such children who are past the age of sixteen, nor where the Guardians considered that either of them is sufficiently able-bodied to earn her own livelihood.'

The Poor Law Board replied 'that, as these children are orphans, and of so tender an age as not to come under the Out Prohibitory Order, it must rest with the Guardians to decide whether they will continue to grant out-relief in the manner referred to.' The competency of Local Boards to adopt Mrs. Archer's plan was thus laid down by the highest authority. That they may relieve, out of the workhouse, deserted children between seven and sixteen years of age, not being able-bodied, had indeed already been stated by the Central Board in a correspondence with the Droitwich union, dated

March 1848.[1] But the Department was then far from approving the plan, and it was not until 1869 that it withdrew all opposition to it. Until that year its promoters had many an alarm lest their work should be upset and their little wards swept back into the workhouse.

For eight or nine years previous to Mrs. Archer's experiment, Mr. Armitstead, unknown to her, had been boarding-out pauper orphans in his parish of Sandbach, and had related his experience before a Select Committee on Poor Relief.[2] Having interested himself in the training of pauper children in various parts of the country since the introduction of the new Poor Law, and being an active *ex officio* Guardian in his own union for many years, he had long, he said, arrived at the opinion that while the State stands to them *in loco parentis*, it gives them no parental education. As regards girls, *segregation* not *congregation*, he emphatically maintained, must be the system pursued; and it was his opinion that the district school intensified the evils of the ordinary workhouse. Pressed by the Hon. C. P. Villiers, Chairman of the Committee, to admit that workhouse girls obtain good places, if not with the upper, at least with employers of the middle class, Mr. Armitstead answered, that during his connection for twenty-four years with the Board of his own union he had never known an instance of a girl leaving it for service in a gentleman's family, although for girls from the National School (where there was a department for industrial training) he had more applications than he could supply. He was convinced that as regarded all but the exceptional few, frequent and rapid was the downward career of pauper girls. Taken from the workhouse, he explained, often for temporary service and into places where they can learn nothing to fit them for better situations, they are soon dismissed with no power of improving their position; but having tasted liberty, they are unwilling to submit again to the restrictions of the workhouse. When supervision by the parochial officer is exercised, it has often a disastrous effect upon the object of it,

[1] *Official Circular of the Poor Law Board*, vol. vii. p. 199.
[2] House of Commons, 1863.

by revealing her connection with the parish, as Mr. Armitstead quoted instances to prove. While imputing no intentional misrepresentation to the Returns cited in support of the success in after life of young women who had received a pauper education, the result of his own extensive and minute inquiries precluded him from placing any confidence in them.

Describing his method of boarding-out, he had obtained, he said, a permissive order from his Board of Guardians to take the children out of the workhouse on his engaging to maintain them on an allowance not exceeding their cost within it, and he placed them to board with respectable cottagers, requiring that they should attend the National Schools. Every case had proved successful. The affection of foster-parents had far exceeded his anticipation. When they happened to be childless their wards seemed to take the place of offspring. In one of these instances, the foster-father (his wife having died) left his savings of £15 to his foster-son for apprenticeship 'and taking care of him when I am gone.' Mr. Armitstead also relied on the mutual affection of foster parents and children to afford help and shelter for the latter in after life should it be needed. In proposing to the Select Committee the introduction into the Poor Law Act of a permissive clause authorising the adoption of his plan, he suggested that a quarterly report on the children might be made after personal inspection by the clergyman of the parish, the Guardian of the township, and the relieving officer of the district, as a safeguard against ill-treatment. He stated further, and this opinion is well worth consideration at the present time, that he considered *all* workhouse children might be advantageously boarded-out except those of able-bodied paupers.

Mrs. Archer's pamphlet fell into the hands of Miss Boucherett, a lady residing in Lincolnshire, and induced her to obtain permission from the Guardians of her own Union to try the plan. The *Englishwoman's Review* for January 1867 contains an interesting account of her experience. Of the first two orphans whom she took out she says, 'Their habits and persons were extremely dirty,

yet I do not believe our workhouse to be worse than the average. . . . I have seen the physically low type of these children much commented on, and described as if they were hereditarily inferior, and a distinct class from other poor.' In a severe case of scrofula the appearances were entirely removed in about eighteen months by an unlimited allowance of bacon, milk, cheese, and bread-and-butter, with some beer and two shillings'-worth a week of butcher's meat, the only instance in which Miss Boucherett paid for extra food. The old woman who acted as foster-mother to the child said she ate as much bacon as a grown man, besides the butcher's meat. 'I am quite convinced that it is the miserable gruel, the ill-cooked food, and the long fasts between meals which fill these wretched children with disease. . . . My girls are all fat and rosy now, and I hope that almost all will turn out respectable. It will perhaps be thought that for one of the five first taken to have turned out ill is a large proportion of failure; but the year before I began to take the girls, *three* out of five returned disgraced to the workhouse after their first year of service. . . . When I sent the first girls out to service I gave them plenty of good clothes. There cannot be greater folly. They should only have bare necessaries, and should feel that they must work to get more. The foster-mothers ought to be very kind people, but it does not answer to get a very kind *first mistress* or the girls are lazy. Firm, strict mistresses are the best at first, but they must be watched to see that no real cruelty or dreadful over-work is inflicted.'

Miss Boucherett herself supervised the children and sent an annual report of each to the Board of Guardians; in short she was Certified Committee and secretary in one. 'This,' she says, 'is the most delightful and least costly mode of doing good. With care and attention I believe success to be certain, and the change in the poor little things in looks and manners and ways is really pleasant.'[1]

The history of the efforts to secure the best training for the children under their care made by the Guardians of Eton Union is peculiarly instructive, in the consideration

[1] *The Englishwoman's Review*, January 1867.

of our subject. In Mr. Tufnell's Report for 1862 we find the school of that Union described as admirable in every department, so far as could be ascertained by two independent inspectors, himself and the Diocesan School inspector, while the success of the pupils in the Diocesan Prize Association seemed to afford a further proof of the excellence of their training. 'Any one,' continues Mr. Tufnell, 'reading the above account might possibly conclude that the school was perfection; and it may excite some surprise when I state that, on close examination, the school appeared in so unsatisfactory a condition that it was determined to break it up and send all the children to the Central London District School, where they now are; I fully concurred in this decision of the Guardians.'

Before arriving at this determination the Guardians had caused a return to be made, showing the particulars, so far as they were known, of all the children placed out as servants or apprentices from January 1858 to December 31st, 1861. More than forty per cent had turned out ill!

Towards the end of 1863 the Guardians were again dissatisfied with the condition of the children. The cost of their maintenance at the District School was almost double that in the workhouse, their health was not good, and they still suffered from the evils of institution life, though these differed in the great school from those encountered in the smaller one, except that in both the Guardians marked the absence of the discipline and influences of family life. 'With a training so wholly unnatural it is rather matter of wonder,' said the Eton Guardians, 'that any one should turn out well than that many should turn out very ill.'[1] Resolved to remove them from Hanwell, the Guardians were at a loss what course to adopt, when apparently, without being aware that the plan was pursued elsewhere, it occurred to them to place the orphan and deserted children to board with respectable cottagers under regulations very similar to those issued by other Boards, except that from the first the Eton Guardians adopted the more

[1] *Home Training for Pauper Children.* Printed by E. Herbert, Slough, 1866.

liberal scale of payment now usual. The plan has been carried on satisfactorily ever since.

'It would be well,' said the *Pall Mall Gazette* of December 1868, 'if London Guardians could be induced, before they plunge further into the enormous cost of erecting additional district schools, to study carefully an experiment in the maintenance of deserted and orphan children now initiated at Chorlton cum Medlock, a very populous but rather poor suburb of Manchester.' It then describes a scheme carefully devised by Mr. C. J. Herford, a Guardian for Chorlton, and recently adopted by the Board, for removing all children suitable for boarding-out from the workhouse as soon as practicable. Under Mr. Herford's direction, aided by lady-visitors, the plan has worked satisfactorily, and has been further extended of late years by placing some of the children at a distance from their own union under the care of certified Committees.

The King's Norton Boarding-out Committee dates from the following year. It first consisted of a few ladies living near Birmingham who, in 1866, formed themselves into a 'Society for Befriending Pauper Children,' with the object of inducing the Birmingham Guardians to substitute boarding-out for aggregation in a large school. They succeeded in obtaining an acceptance of their recommendation, and the Birmingham Board applied to the Central Department for permission to carry it into effect. This request was, however, peremptorily refused, and it was not until July 1870 that the first pauper child from that parish was placed under the care of the ladies. A like proposal was made by ladies living in the neighbourhood of Clifton to the Guardians of their union, and met with precisely the same fate. They too eventually obtained the children, and are still carrying on their good work.

It was early in 1869 that the attention of Colonel C. W. Grant, R.E., *ex officio* Guardian for Bath, was drawn to the success already attending the plan. There happened to be great pressure for accommodation in the workhouse, and the Guardians had it under consideration to build. With a view of saving this expenditure, still more perhaps

to better the condition of the children, Col. Grant put himself into communication with Boards who had already adopted the scheme, extending his inquiries to Scotland and Ireland, and his enthusiasm for it growing as proofs thickened of its excellence, he threw the information he received into the form of a Report, by which he could impart to others the information he had collected.[1] It not only converted his own Board to his views, but a large edition being struck off and rapidly sold, created wide interest in the subject, and gave a great impetus to the extension of the plan.

Early in the same year Miss Preusser, of Windermere, familiar with the system in her native country, Germany, was desirous to bring the workhouse children of London under its beneficent operation. She had applied to certain of the Metropolitan Boards for some, and the Bethnal Green Guardians were disposed to accept her proposal, when they were informed by the Poor Law Board that they were precluded by the Relief Regulation Order from placing children with persons living beyond the limits of their own union. The disappointment on both sides was great, but however disappointed, Miss Preusser was not daunted. She prepared a Memorial setting forth the reasons in favour of Boarding-out, expressing an earnest desire that the pauper children of our great cities might be allowed to share them, and offering the co-operation of ladies in providing for their safety and welfare in any way that might seem expedient to the Department. She obtained the signatures of more than 3,000 Englishwomen to this Memorial, and in the spring of 1870, when Mr. Goschen was President of the Poor Law Board, she procured his consent to receive a deputation of ladies—the first which waited upon a Government Department—to present it. Influenced no doubt by the favourable Report on Boarding-out recently presented by Mr. Henley, the Department granted the prayer of the memorialists. In the following November it issued an Order sanctioning the boarding-out of children beyond

[1] *Advantages of the Boarding-out System.* By Col. C. W. Grant, R.E. Macmillan and Co., 1869.

their own unions, under the care of certified committees on lines indicated in the first edition of this book.

It was drawn with great care, and embodied regulations framed to secure high character and permanence in the committees, and to fence the children round with a variety of safeguards in their foster-homes. It was, however, avowedly tentative, and after the experience of several years, amendments have been found necessary, and are now (January 1889) under the consideration of the Local Government Board.

Children defined in the Order of 1870 to be eligible for boarding-out are orphans, or, being illegitimate, deserted by the mother, or, being legitimate, deserted by both parents or deserted by one parent, the other parent being dead or under sentence of penal servitude, or suffering permanently from mental disease, or out of England. The new Order will, it is expected, be more elastic.[1] Mr. Arthur Peel, the present Speaker of the House of Commons, was, at the time when the Order was issued, Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board. A Letter from him accompanied it setting forth the arguments in favour of Boarding-out, and the relative merits of this scheme, and of pauper schools, with great clearness and impartiality. Although, as we have shown in an earlier chapter, the intellectual results obtained in the District and Separate schools, and their advantage to boys (of whom only Mr. Peel speaks), are not equal to what the originators of the schools anticipated, and long believed them to be, the favourable opinion of them expressed in this Letter was at its date in accordance with general conviction.

'With regard to the ordinary *Workhouse Schools*,' it says, 'the difficulties are so great, that the best efforts of Boards of Guardians to render them efficient are often defeated. Imperfect classification, incomplete separation from the adult inmates, the associations inseparable from the workhouse, and the circumstance that orphans who

[1] For this and other proposed changes see the Evidence of Miss Hall (Hon. Secretary to the Association for the Advancement of Boarding-out) before the Select Committee on Poor Relief [H. L.], 1888.

may be unfortunately thrown out of employment a few years after leaving the workhouse, invariably look upon it as their natural home where they have left their friends and acquaintances, the fluctuating terms for which the children are admitted, and the smaller competition for the posts of schoolmaster and mistress in workhouse as compared with other schools, constitute difficulties of too formidable a character, both in social and educational respects, to justify any preference for the system if any other practice should appear to offer reasonable chances of success.

'On the other hand, the educational and industrial advantages of the District and Separate Schools, especially in the case of boys, are undeniable; and the Board desire to render full justice to the zeal, ability, and liberality with which many of them have been managed. Indeed, it appears scarcely to admit of a doubt that, as regards the imparting of instruction, they confer a higher degree of education than is likely to be acquired by children boarded-out. Where permanent and secure employment can be found for boys on leaving these schools—as, for instance, in the case of the numerous boys drafted into regimental bands, or into the sea service from some of the Metropolitan Schools—their success seems complete. But these schools are deficient, especially in the case of girls, from the unavoidable circumstance that no family or domestic ties of any kind are established, and that the children have no other home to fall back upon than the workhouse, in the frequent event of troubles befalling them. Besides, they have another disadvantage; orphans and deserted children brought up in Pauper-Schools live there continuously. There is no change from their school-life during a part of the year, such as is enjoyed by children brought up in public schools in other spheres of life. The monotony and confinement of pauper-schools must necessarily be unbroken, and prevent to a great extent the development of many of those faculties of mind and body which, in the case of children who must look forward to a hard industrial life, it is most important to expand. No system of public education can possibly

supply the place of that parental care and those home influences of which orphans and deserted children are necessarily deprived. In the District Schools naturally no attempt of the kind can be made. They aim at, and have succeeded in giving, the best intellectual and industrial training possible under the circumstances.

The Boarding-out system aims at solving the problem in a different direction, and while inferior as an agency for intellectual education, it may possibly secure many other advantages of a very high order, both to the children themselves and to the community, by replacing the children to a certain extent in that family life from which it is a calamity for them to be entirely excluded.

'It is further urged in the strongest manner by the advocates of the Boarding-out system, that it tends to merge the pauper children to whom it is applied, in the general body of the population; and if this result can be achieved, no more powerful argument can be adduced in favour of the scheme.'

The Order limits the weekly sum payable to foster-parents for a child's maintenance, *i.e.* food and lodging, to 4s. Clothing, school pence, and medical attendance are items the payment for which is left to the discretion of the Board of Guardians. The cost of maintenance varies with the locality. In some districts 3s. is ample, but in expensive neighbourhoods, and for a radius of many miles round the Metropolis, the full amount of 4s. is probably not too much. The extra items usually amount to a little over a shilling a week. A fair average for the whole country may be struck at 4s. 9d.; in some places the total cost is rather over 5s., while it is barely more than 4s. under the King's Norton Committee, which nevertheless shows success in the after career of its wards equal to that of any other Committee. We believe still lower rates are paid in some rural neighbourhoods, but we are not acquainted with the results obtained.

In Mr. Peel's letter, Boarding-out within the limits of the union is spoken of somewhat doubtfully. It was, however, the only legal form in which the plan then existed in

England, and notwithstanding defects, its good results had aroused public attention to the advantages of the system, and obtained its favourable recognition by the State. Certainly it needed additional safeguards, and some years later these were sought to be supplied by an Order issued in 1877, which will be dealt with in its proper place. The method of this later Order is unfortunate certainly in one respect. It requires that inspection and supervision shall be performed by poor-law officers, thus both maintaining the child's connection with pauperism, and depriving it more or less—it may be entirely—of the opportunity of winning the sympathy and friendship of unofficial neighbours of higher rank given by the Certified Committee. In other particulars its articles are much the same as those of the Order of 1870, excepting that there is no restriction as to age. In this respect, as sanctioning the boarding-out of infants, we hold it to be greatly superior, and hope that similar power will be granted in the amended Order regulating Boarding-out beyond the union.

Miss Preusser lost no time in organising a Certified Committee under the new Order. On the 5th of December it concluded an agreement with the Bethnal Green Guardians (and subsequently with others), and five little girls were to be at once transferred to its care. But owing to the delays with which those engaged in Poor-law work are familiar, but which are apt to wear out the patience of the uninitiated and are a very real evil to Committees and foster-parents, the children did not arrive until the following July.

The King's Norton Committee obtained a Certificate in January 1871, and entered into agreement with the Birmingham Guardians to take charge of 150 children. It had increased its own numbers in proportion to the work contemplated, and obtained homes scattered over an area forty miles in length and ten in width. The Birmingham children have been transferred to the separate school at Marston Green Cottage Homes, opened in 1880; but as three Metropolitan Boards, as well as those of Aston, Kidderminster, Chorlton, and Salford, send children to this Committee, its area and numbers have been still further

enlarged, until a series of little boarding-out *Colonies*, so to speak, have been founded in different Midland districts. In each of these one or more, but generally at least three or four, members of the Committee reside. They are in close communication with the Birmingham centre, receiving from it advice or personal assistance whenever wanted.

Some years ago the Local Government Board, fearing that this and other Committees at Plymouth, Cambridge, and elsewhere might lose in efficiency by extension, directed them to break themselves up into several smaller organisations. The obstacles in the way of compliance proved to be manifold, and far more difficult to overcome than evidently the Department had foreseen. One of them lay in the unwillingness of the proposed 'new formations' to lose the benefits accruing from a centre connected with a large and important town; indeed this reluctance has been so great among the members of the King's Norton Committee that, so far, it has been possible to form only one of the projected small organisations, and this not until consent was obtained for it to place the Secretary of the parent Committee on its list of members.

A small committee has undoubtedly merits of its own. For instance, it can be formed by two or three persons unable to spare much time, and with whom the work must go hand in hand with other cognate occupations, and thus a few homes may be utilised which might otherwise be lost. But the larger association has advantages which the smaller one must forego. The King's Norton Committee, for instance, embraces representatives of all creeds, including Roman Catholic and Jewish ladies, enabling it to accept children of corresponding faiths, and investing it with commensurate influence. Through its Birmingham members it has access to several medical and other helpful institutions, affording opportunities of benefit to the children under its care of the highest value. Especially is this felt in regard to the Eye Hospital and the Children's Hospital in dealing with a class liable to inherited and constitutional diseases needing great skill and experience. It is thus enabled to take charge of children defective in sight or limb, or other-

wise seriously affected in health, which the small rural Committee would not be justified in undertaking. Upon several such afflicted little ones it has bestowed health and the powers of self-support, who, without its intervention, must have dragged out a miserable existence in the parish infirmary.

The Reports issued by Miss Preusser (Garnett, Windermere) and those of the King's Norton Committee (Caswell, Broad Street, Birmingham) constitute a history of the movement, so far as touched by them, to the present date; and are full of instructive statistics, and sometimes very touching information. The success obtained in 'floating' the children when able to earn their living (at an age frequently below that at which it is usual for them to be sent forth from the great schools) fulfils the highest expectations of these Committees, while the improvement in health and *physique* generally, and the low death-rate, are equally satisfactory. Many of the children have savings in the Post Office, amounting now and then even to £20. One of Miss Preusser's girls withdrew hers a few weeks before she died of consumption, as she wished that her funeral might be paid for with her own money, bequeathing the remainder to her only brother.

The same month that Miss Preusser received her five little girls from Bethnal Green, the Rev. W. P. Trevelyan, then Rector of Calverton, near Stony Stratford, met his 'first little company of parentless fledglings, brought down to be distributed into their various nests in July 1871. . . . They were neatly dressed, not in uniform, and were provided with all that was needful in the way of outfit. They were all lively at first, but as the process of dispersion proceeded the little faces became somewhat gloomy, and at last those remaining cried bitterly. . . . But the gloom was soon over, and in every case, it being about dinner time, a good meal had been provided. The children gave the impression of having been well cared for; but nearly all were afflicted with ophthalmia, some very much so. They had a peculiar walk, too, with a cramped movement of the legs and feet, suggestive of their necessarily cramped life; and the funny nod, accompanied by a little 'hem!' in answer

to anything said to them, all bespoke the inevitable effect of a mechanical treatment, by which neither the powers of the body nor the faculties of the mind and spirit can be duly developed. The worst cases of ophthalmia were at once attended to by a doctor. No specific remedy was used, but with attention to the general health, aided by the wholesome air of the country, the disease gradually and at length entirely disappeared. There was no instance of its being communicated to other children.'[1] The little boarders were sent by the St. George's, Hanover Square, Board, and the Committee have continued to receive its relays only from that union.

The narrative from which we have quoted was given at the house of the late Sir Charles Trevelyan, one of the most earnest and enlightened supporters of Boarding-out. It rapidly sketches the experience of Mr. Trevelyan's Committee for five years, and its later history has been published by the Association for the Advancement of Boarding-out.[2] Calverton, a rural parish with a population of about 300, and as time went on adjoining parishes of the same character, afford very favourable conditions to the system. At any rate its success has been very great there, and its aspect most attractive. We can recall few days more enjoyable than one spent in visiting the children in that district. It chanced that at the first foster-home we entered a bridal party were seated at a modest wedding repast, while the church bells were ringing a joyous peal. A grown up foster-child of the family, who had been for some years in excellent service, had come *home* to be married.

We have described the work of these three Committees at some length, as being among the very earliest certified, and as receiving a comparatively large number of children; but similar experiences are met with in the annals of the smaller organisations.

The early objection to Boarding-out, that a sufficient number of respectable homes could not be found, was no

[1] *Report of a Drawing-room Conference on Boarding-out Pauper Children.* London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1876.
[2] *Leaflet No.* 3, *September* 1886.

sooner disposed of than doubt was thrown on the affection which foster-parents would feel for the children of other people—a doubt which must have been suggested in ignorance of the strong development of the maternal feeling. Among uncultured women it is a sentiment which they do not stifle or analyse, but on which they act. A woman may slap her neighbour's child without scruple if she thinks it has done hardly by one of her own, but let that neighbour die and she will be the first to 'Mother' the little orphan. Such devotion to forlorn children is abundantly proved by the numbers of excellent foster-mothers who accept the charge of these little paupers for a payment barely covering expenses, and which rarely indeed represents all they spend on the children. In districts where this plan has become thoroughly understood, applications for them almost invariably far exceed the number to be provided for; yet the applicants know that profit cannot be made out of them. Indeed they fully realise that they are taking their part in a benevolent action. 'It is a good work,' said one foster-mother who was bringing up her third foster-child, 'and we should never have done it if it had not been for Mr. Trevelyan'—'a work of true mercy done by the poorest'—as he himself expressed it. Miss Boucherett tells of a woman, busy at her wash-tub, to whom she applied for counsel respecting the outfit for the orphans going to service. She gave very sensible advice, but without stopping a moment in her operations, and with so little courtesy of manner that her interlocutor felt tempted to curtail her questioning. But as the latter turned to depart, the woman paused in her work and said, with her hands clasped in the suds, 'The Lord prosper you, and bless the poor lassies.'

There are foster-mothers of the Dolly Winthrop stamp, to whose simple faith it would not be 'easy lying down for anybody, when they'd got to another world, if they hadn't done their part by the helpless children as come wi'out their own asking,'—women wise in the rearing of children, administering needful correction 'in soft safe places,' and under whose fostering care babies, like flowers, thrive and put forth their best.

It is sometimes objected that the payment allowed is too small, and that a larger sum would attract higher class homes. But we answer, the children should be placed as nearly as possible in the same material conditions as those to which they were born, and payment which would leave any decided margin of profit would tend to a most objectionable form of out-relief, and demoralise the whole scheme by bringing forward a wrong class as foster-parents. It has been urged that you cannot *buy* parental love. Most true; and the King's Norton Committee declines to receive from Guardians the full amount of payments sanctioned by the Local Government Board to avoid the risk of applications for the sake of profit; yet the love somehow comes, for it was one of their foster-mothers, a poor widow, who bestowed on her foster-daughter, suffering from a terrible abscess of the lungs, the tender care which certainly no sum of money could have bought. She nursed her to the injury of her own health, and she and the Doctor got to curious cross purposes when he questioned her about the child's antecedents, 'because,' as he afterwards explained, 'it never occurred to him that any one but an own mother could have shown such devotion.' The philanthropy of the poor, when appealed to through their affections, is often of the highest order, and no truer sympathy than theirs is found in giving help. 'The poorest poor—

> 'Long for some moments in a weary life
> When they can know and feel that they have been
> Themselves the fathers and the dealers-out
> Of some small blessings—have been kind to such
> As needed kindness, for this single cause
> That we have all of us one human heart.'

It is a special merit of the boarding-out scheme that it recognises this 'one human heart,' bringing all classes together in sympathy for the same cause, and enabling the poor to take their part in the common duty of rendering aid to the unfortunate. Better far for them, as for us all, to co-operate in charity than to be always its object.

Serious charges on the foster-parents' part against the children, of ill-behaviour, and requests for their removal, are

very rare, though it is not unusual to hear them complain of difficult temper, dirty and pilfering habits, and especially of stupidity—'Law, they be just like wooden children,' is often remarked of those who have been long in the pauper schools. But patient indeed are the efforts to overcome their faults, and should such efforts fail, removal to another home and other influences, especially the warning from the visiting lady that a return to the workhouse will be the last resort, rarely fails to effect a cure. Occasionally the process takes time. Little Dicky 'was a queer little chap when he first came,' one foster-mother told us, 'with sore eyes and so rickety and sickly he couldn't walk no distance, and he was so funny too in his ways, running in and telling all the neighbours what we'd got for dinner, and shouting out when my husband came home that *he'd* got a father now. Any one could see he hadn't been brought up like other children, but he came all right in a year or so.' Little Dicky is now second gardener in a nobleman's establishment, having worked himself up to that position, and he spends his annual week's holiday at his adopted home like a son of the house.

It has been observed that the foster-parent's illness or sorrow seems to bring out the child's affection, and that one who has been troublesome when all was prosperous, becomes helpful and dutiful when misfortune falls upon the family. If there have been no actual ill-conduct before, but only the indifference of childhood, grief shared with the household will develop tenderness and sympathy previously unsuspected. 'A little fellow had the grief of seeing his foster-father, to whom he had become much attached, die after a few minutes' struggle. The widow was greatly affected by the shock. Her grown-up sons came from their distant homes to her assistance, and waited upon her, and nursed her as daughters might during the few days they could spare. When they left, after the funeral had taken place, she found the little foster-son, about nine years of age, had voluntarily taken upon himself the duties of affection they had discharged. Coming down in the morning she discovered him already preparing her breakfast; and though the tea

he had brewed was very black, and the toast he had made was very thick, yet the spirit in which he had striven to serve her made the food palatable to the invalid.'[1]

Nor must the reflex action upon the best feelings of the companions of these poor children be overlooked. The kind-hearted mistress of a village school had been interested by the President of a newly-formed Boarding-out Committee in behalf of a party of workhouse orphans who had come to their new homes. When they made their first appearance in her school she drew them to her knee, and calling their schoolfellows around her, she explained that the new comers were strangers without father or mother, needing love and friendliness. Her appeal brought a ready response, and the orphans hold a favoured place in the little community. Mrs. Archer long ago found her orphans evoked much kindly feeling among the villagers; and Mr. Henley gives us a glimpse of the friendly disposition to the parish children in Scotland among their companions, when he tells us he saw at school 'an Edinburgh parochial boy between the schoolmaster's and a farmer's son, with his arms on their shoulders, using the same hymn-book.'[2]

The willingness of foster-parents to receive the children, diseased as they often are, may indeed provoke surprise. 'Please let him come at once,' was the answer of a worthy couple when they were told that their selected foster-child, whom they had not yet seen, was suffering in the workhouse infirmary from glandular swellings, and needed nursing and medical care. Another intending foster-mother begged that a sickly child might be chosen for her, 'as most needing a mother's care.' 'We had,' said Mr. Greig (of Edinburgh), 'a boy with hip disease, and the Managers, thinking that he was a trouble to the foster-mother, offered to take him back, but she would not part with him.'[3]

[1] *Leaflet No. 7 of the Association for the Advancement of Boarding-out*, June 1887.

[2] *Report on Boarding-out in Scotland.*

[3] *Report of a Drawing-room Conference.*

None can wonder that such single-minded devotion should work remarkable cures. A child of five years old, who had been nearly three years in the workhouse and most of that time in the infirmary, had, when transferred to his foster-home, an obstinate rash spreading over his head and body, and could hardly walk. In three months' time he had gained two and a half pounds in weight, and had not once required a doctor, had no rash, and ran about with delight playing at horses with his foster-brother.

It is, however, the experience of Boarding-out Committees of long standing that, as the children approach 13 or 14 years of age, symptoms of hereditary disease and of the mischief wrought by want, exposure, and neglect in infancy are apt to reappear, needing great care to tide these young people over the period of adolescence. Here is evidence of the desirableness of Boarding-out as early as possible, and of drawing no hard and fast line in regard to the age at which self-support must begin. At present the extra cost of postponing it beyond the usual limits of parochial payment is generally met by the generosity of the Committee and the foster-parents; but we may hope that, as Guardians more and more realise the economy to the rates of Boarding-out, they will feel the justice of at least supplementing the needful outlay.

One very plausible objection often urged against the system is founded on the wretched condition of the dwellings of some of our poor. This is no argument against Boarding-out, but against such housing of the poor, which, wherever it exists, is a reproach to our municipal and national legislation, and often, though not always, to the landlord. So far as Boarding-out draws attention to this evil, it renders incidentally an important service; but after leaving out of the calculation all the dwellings of our labouring classes which, while considered fit for *them*, are yet pronounced not good enough for our little paupers, there remain an abundance of healthy and decent foster-homes available. The system has indeed a directly ameliorating effect on the housing of the poor. It both leads to the improvement of individual cottages by those anxious to utilise the good

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

qualities of the owners in behalf of the children, and it induces the cottagers themselves to make and to keep their houses more commodious and healthful when they find these conditions are necessary to enable them to obtain children, while they learn how such bettering may be done from the persons of higher education with whom the system brings them into friendly intercourse. Windows have been made, and many opened that never were opened before, to prepare the cottages for the little boarders.

The objection to overcrowding comes with bad grace from any upholders of the workhouse or big school system, where overcrowding is common in spite of the strictest regulations to the contrary. Mr. Tufnell himself speaks of metropolitan schools having 1000 children when built only for 800,[1] and there are few schools probably which are not overcrowded from time to time.

In a Report full of horrors on the crowded state of St. Pancras workhouse many years ago, the late Dr. Bence Jones says he did not find 'more than four in a bed.'[2] Four children in a bed is a sight still to be seen sometimes within workhouse walls; and other and greater evils of overcrowding may be discovered in pauper establishments than in even very humble cottages if the house father and mother be sensible and rightminded. Such qualifications in the foster-parents it rests with the Boarding-out Committee to secure. It is for them to choose such homes as offer suitable accommodation, and where the family is not too large.

The children boarded-out vary greatly in social position and habits. Sometimes they are of respectable parentage, deprived of father and mother by early death, or by that mental illness which is worse than death. In these cases the poor little orphans are if possible spared the degradation of entering the workhouse at all, and are sent at once to their new homes. Others, on the contrary, are of very low origin, and the change which removes them from relations is often a gain indeed. A little boy of this class was taken by a local Secretary to her own house for a day or two to

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1869-70.
[2] Dr. Bence Jones's *Report on St. Pancras Workhouse*, 1856.

fill up an unavoidable gap between workhouse and foster-home. He seemed to feel himself quite at home, and made friends with the servants, especially with the parlour-maid. Trotting after her when she had occasion to open the hall-door, a policeman appeared on the threshold, who had brought letters for the master of the house, a magistrate. At sight of the officer the child became agitated, and immediately, with rapid instinctive action, turned his pockets inside out to prove they were void of stolen property, exclaiming, 'I done nothing—I'm *sure* I done nothing.' The child's father was a professed thief, but his mother must have seen better days, for, in dread of a pauper's funeral, she had hoarded a small sum, unknown as she thought, for her burial; this was stolen, as she lay unconscious, by her eldest son, who leant over her dying form to take the money from its hiding-place, his little brother being the sole witness of his baseness. The foster-mother found the child's head covered with scars 'like,' as she expressed it, 'a loaf pricked with a fork.' He was dull and slow, as though depressed by continued ill-treatment; but he has brightened wonderfully in a pleasant country home, and is now doing well as an apprentice to a tailor.

Another family of several sisters and a brother who are boarded-out together, saw their father murder his wife, their mother, for which he received a sentence of penal servitude. Lately released on ticket of leave, he found that his eldest daughter had gone to respectable service, and, greatly to the poor girl's horror, paid her an unexpected visit. She wrote at once to the Secretary just named, and measures were taken to prevent the wretched man offering any further molestation or dragging his children down to his own level. Had the girl been brought up in a district school, to whom could she have applied for protection?

The mere association with honest working-people, who speak of crime and vice with abhorrence, is in itself a benefit to this pitiable class of children. Generally vacillating in character and easily influenced, these it is who fall an easy prey in the pauper schools to the insidious influences of wicked companions.

The physical advantages of boarding-out have been so clearly stated in Mr. Henley's words that it seems almost needless to insist on them further. As compared with the inmates of the schools, the children play habitually in lanes and green fields instead of asphalted yards, and they relish their food better and get far more variety in it; they do not of course altogether escape sickness, though their portion is remarkably small, and being scattered, they are not exposed to the danger besetting large numbers in an epidemic. Such a sad occurrence as that of nearly 300 children ill at once with typhoid fever, as in the outbreak at Ashford, would be impossible under boarding-out. The foster-mothers indeed sometimes find to their cost that, notwithstanding the Certificate of Health sent with the child from the workhouse, and however conscientious the Medical Officer may have been, skin disease has remained latent, and will break out again after apparent cure, under new conditions of life. But those conditions are natural and healthful, and the malady being properly treated, however deep-seated, wears itself out in time. We have known cases ordered for Boarding-out to be detained month after month in the Infirmary that they might leave with clear skins or freedom from other forms of disease, who perhaps never got their clean bill of health at all; and yet, could they have been sent in the beginning, there is no doubt they would soon have become perfectly well in their foster-homes.

Ophthalmia is unknown among the boarded-out children unless they take it with them from the school, when it soon disappears under the invigorating conditions of the new life. In Ireland it is a national disease (there is a special form called Irish ophthalmia), yet the following quotation, referring to an outbreak of ophthalmia in the Cork workhouse in the summer of 1887, curiously confirms our statement based on wide observation. 'In the boys' school 74 per cent of the pupils were suffering from affection of the eye, of greater or less severity. In the girls' school 80 per cent were affected. In the infants' school 63 per cent had some form of eye-disease. In the nursery there was no case of eye-disease. In the boys' hospital there were 32

cases; of these 25 were under treatment for eye-affections. In the girls' hospital 8 out of 21 were eye cases. With few exceptions, the disease took the form of granular ophthalmia, and was in many instances associated with other scrofulous affections. Those children who were quite free from the disease were in most instances those who have been recently admitted. Among boarded-out children there were only 2 cases of ophthalmia out of over 100 children. The chief reason for its continued prevalence was its communicability from one child to another by direct contact, and it was kept alive by overcrowding, insufficient ventilation, or improper food. Most of the conditions favourable to fostering this disease were present in the school, giving it no chance of dying out or being suppressed. In the schoolroom the windows were unprotected by blinds. Recreation consisted in a walk along the hot and dusty roads, or in the time spent in the still dustier playground or yard. In the hospital the arrangements for ventilation, especially in the boys' hospital, seemed defective. The immediate cause of the recent outbreak of acute ophthalmia was probably the exposure of children, bearing in their eyes the disease in a latent form, to sun and dust during the sudden advent of hot weather. As a means of permanently checking the disease, an effort should be made to remove as many of the children as possible into the country on the boarding-out system. The benefit of fresh air and of vegetables was incalculable in the constitutional treatment of the disease, by which alone it could be effectually eradicated.'[1]

Mr Henley tells us that in Scotland the onus of finding places when the children are able to go to work rests upon the parents, and from some parishes, if they fail to find them, they receive no more boarders.[2] Generally, however, the obligation resolves itself into the natural sense of responsibility on the part of the parent, and it is in every way desirable that this should be fostered. It is so in England more or less. The King's Norton Committee rely upon it,

[1] *British Medical Journal*, Aug. 1887. Outbreak of Ophthalmia in the Cork Workhouse.

[2] *Report on Boarding-out in Scotland.*

although ready to give advice and help when necessary; and at Calverton, and probably under most Committees, the same sound view prevails. The tie is thus strengthened between parent and child just at the time when this is most important; and instead of a feeling of alienation springing up in the child's mind by some one else in the character of a patron stepping in to his aid and protection, he feels he owes his safe launch in life to the forethought of his parents, and that corresponding effort to win success is due to them. Under these natural conditions, too, the children, both boys and girls, have the best chance of taking up the employment for which they have special ability or liking. All girls are not fitted for domestic service, the one employment with scarcely any exception they are put to on leaving the pauper school—while those boarded out share the general opportunities for choice. Though a large majority become servants, dressmaking, factory work, and the teaching profession all attract them. A girl boarded-out some years ago, and afterwards doing well as a pupil teacher, lately gave up the post to keep her foster-father's books—an arrangement of great mutual benefit.

In the pauper school, boys may be set to work at what is wanted in the institution without reference to their individual taste or capacity, or to the demands of the labour market; the result being that, on leaving, they frequently have to turn to some quite fresh work, and reap no benefit from their previous training. When boarded-out, a lad has ample opportunity of observing a variety of employments, and almost instinctively selects the one most to his taste; or he profits by the status of his foster-father to be introduced as a son to his own trade or calling, and has already probably picked up much experience in the work. We recall, for instance, a lad who on holidays accompanies his foster-father, a carrier, on his rounds, thus learning the duties of a responsible post as efficiently as if he were apprenticed to it; and in many other forms of well-paid labour a boy, when helping the father, is fitting himself unconsciously to take as good a position in the world.

And here we may show why we are obliged to dissent

from the Circular Letter of Mr. Peel previously quoted, in respect to the superiority of the industrial training in district schools. The cottage-garden and cow-house, besides pigs and poultry, often kept by men chosen as foster-fathers, give means of training which even the very same material at the pauper school fails to afford, for however conscientious the officer in charge may be in his efforts to train, the main motive for energy and thrift is lacking in the lad, and often what he acquires are habits of eye service and of the grossest wastefulness.

The fact brought constantly to the mind of the boarded-out lad by the example of his friends, as it never can be to the pauper schoolboy, that the continued enjoyment of freedom and pleasure in life depends in great measure on his own good behaviour, gives a practical significance to well-doing, or helps in difficult cases to strengthen the wavering tendencies to good. There are disappointments and failures, but the proportion, we aver, is smaller than in any other mode of up-bringing yet adopted, while the success attained is on a higher scale. For instance, the girls as a rule take service in the households of the upper classes, on a level with the daughters of superior working people. Contrast this with the experience of the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants. Together with the girls from pauper schools, it befriends an outside very humble class, designated 'locals,' and it finds it is with these only that the 'central' or School girls can be ranked. No doubt the unwearied efforts of the Society may enable some of both classes to rise through small places and after training in special Homes to high-class service, but these are exceptions; usually only a much lower position in the social scale is reached. Boys, too, who have been boarded-out, here as in Scotland, have a higher range of occupations open to them than can usually be got for lads from pauper schools. 'Why, it takes two years to knock the life into a district schoolboy,' said the Superintendent of a Working Boys' Home, who has had much experience of the class, as well as of what M.A.B.Y.S. would call 'locals;' and this lack of 'life'

and of knowledge of any special calling sends many a lad from the big pauper school to the workhouse, after a vain attempt to get him employment from a Home. They are very difficult to 'float' from provincial schools too, and the boys, growing into lazy, useless men, are still the despair of Boards of Guardians, though we hope the number is less than it was formerly.

It may be alleged that the boarded-out children belong by birth to a higher class than those retained in the schools. It is possible that some of the orphans do, though the proportion must be small; but as regards the deserteds, the inference is all the other way. The habits, indeed, of most of the children show that no line can be drawn between them and those retained in the schools.

It is significant that many persons, at first distrustful or ignorant of the advantages of boarding-out, are rapidly impressed in its favour when they come in contact with its actual working. The late Mr. George Moore gave up an Orphanage he had projected upon his own estate for the reception of all the orphans in the Cumberland workhouses, when the land was already staked out for building, on hearing of Boarding-out; and becoming convinced of its superiority, he devoted himself to obtaining its general adoption. The placing out of the first twelve children he thus disposed of was, he declared, 'the happiest day's work he ever did.'[1]

The late Miss Menella Smedley once thought that the conditions of the houses of the poor were such that the large and seemingly well-ordered schools must be better places for training the young. She was one of Mrs. Nassau Senior's helpers in her inspection of pauper children, and her book, *Boarding-out and Pauper Schools*,[2] shows the revolution effected in her opinions by the knowledge she thus gained.

Besides testimony from Scotland already quoted, we

[1] *Conference on Poor Law Administration held at Gilsland. Daily Journal* Office, Newcastle on Tyne, 1872.

[2] *Boarding-out and District Schools.* London: Henry G. King & Co., 1875.

find an Edinburgh workhouse master telling Mr. Henley that on entering on his engagement he was terribly disappointed to find that the children were not retained in the house, but had long ago become convinced that to put them out was the best plan yet known; and Mr. Adamson avowing that he came to Glasgow resolved if possible to break the system down.

The Guardians of Barton Regis, who adopted Boarding-out with the aid of a committee of ladies twenty years ago, have lately given fresh proof of their faith in the system.

In their experience, as in that of many other Boards, children enter the workhouse under conditions which make them ineligible for boarding-out, but which may before long be changed. In the meanwhile the child goes into the school, and by the time it becomes qualified for being placed out the circumstances connected with it are forgotten, and in the school it remains. A form has been prepared at Barton Regis, to be filled up with all the particulars concerning each child on its entrance necessary to be known should it be afterwards desired to board it out, particulars which will be useful in case of emigration or other method of disposing of it.[1]

Objection to Boarding-out has been raised by political economists on the ground that it gives the children of paupers an unfair advantage over those of the poor unhelped by the rates, and the late lamented Professor Fawcett also feared it would make pauperism attractive to parents.[2] But the anticipated evil has not been realised. It may be remarked that the law requires pauper children to be maintained and educated in some way or other, and jealousy would be more reasonably excited by bringing them up in palatial and costly schools attended by an army of officers and servants than under the humble conditions of labouring life. But the respectable poor are among the first to acknowledge that children born paupers are so heavily handicapped as to need all the help they can have; while Boarding-out, instead of offering to lazy and dissolute

[1] See Appendix.

[2] *Pauperism: its Causes and Remedies.* Macmillan & Co, 1871.

parents the allurement of the big school, whence they can remove them at pleasure, actually prevents their being thrown on the rates. Wherever adopted, the usual effect of Boarding-out has been the withdrawal of children by parents and relations unwilling to let them go out of their own reach. Any opinion advanced by Professor Fawcett deserves respectful consideration, and he undoubtedly has influenced many persons against the plan. But his was not a mind which, once made up, would never alter. On the contrary, his opinions were always open to revision in the light of fresh information. As time went on proofs multiplied of the soundness of the system he had distrusted, and with characteristic candour he declared his apprehension of evil was removed, and that the plan—provided, of course, it were wisely administered—had won his approval. He wished his changed convictions should be made known.[1]

While the selection of foster-parents is perhaps the most important duty of those who administer Boarding-out, the supervision of the children in their homes is certainly the most delicate, and with it must be bracketed official inspection; that both should be vigilant, and yet duly respect the position and authority of the foster-parents, is an axiom with those long experienced in the work. The system which now prevails in England, based upon the Order of 1870, is well-devised, and may be relied upon for success when carried into effect with prudence and integrity. The Certified Committee is responsible to the Local Government Board whence it derives its authority, for the selection of proper homes and for a full and uninterrupted knowledge of the condition of the children, with immediate action to remedy anything amiss. The

[1] *Charity Organisation Review*, July 1885.

It is evident that Mr. Leslie Stephen, when he wrote Fawcett's Life, was not aware of this change of opinion. It was stated by Mr. Fawcett in conversation with the author of *Children of the State* in May 1882. The course of events had shown him that strong theoretical objections vanished in practice. These objections, set forth by Mr. Stephen, have been incidentally dealt with in our narrative, and to recapitulate and answer them here would be to repeat ourselves.

Local Government Board is responsible to the Guardians who employ the Committees it has sanctioned, for the satisfactory discharge of the duties they have undertaken, of which it must assure itself through its inspectors. Briefly, it is for Committees to carry the system into effect, so far as possible, without errors; and, should errors arise, it is for inspectors to discover and draw attention to them for their rectification—not to attempt to rectify them themselves, which is out of their province. It is for them, in fact, to observe and to report.

Now, these duties are comparatively easy in regard to schools and like institutions, though even here experience shows most erroneous impressions may be received, as we have seen happened many years ago at Eton, and in the case of the cruel schoolmistress spoken of at page 17. In school inspection there are long-established rules to follow, written records for analysis and deduction, undisputed principles for guidance, and a long series of previous reports forming models. But inspection of this methodical character clearly cannot be pursued without great modifications in private dwellings, scattered east and west, north and south, with foster-parents of the most diverse temperaments and wholly unaccustomed to cut-and-dry rules, of very varied occupations, and with many grades of position, which, though perhaps scarcely perceptible to a stranger, are, to themselves, strongly marked. To such it is impossible to apply one and the same Procrustean measure. It is very difficult to decide on a just standard of requirement. The most reasonable seems to be that the boarded-out child should be brought up as well in all respects as those of our respectable poor in the locality where such child is placed—for the gauge of well-being varies widely in different parts of the country. Such a standard, varying as it must do, demands for its application considerable tact as well as knowledge of the life and habits of our poor throughout the land. To expect qualities and ways of thinking in foster-parents different from those common to their class is unjust to them, and would be likely to prejudice them against taking charge of the children; and to

require a higher mode of living would justify the complaint that boarding-out raises pauper children above those of the honest and industrious poor. Simple as the standard we have proposed seems, it yet presents obvious difficulties. To differences of rank, education, and mental habit between inspector and inspected are added other items of complexity. Foster parents may have a good moral influence on a boarded-out child, and yet their cottage may be rough and deficient in arrangements regarded as so essential to the mere decencies of life by delicately brought up gentlefolk, that their absence may seem to imply even moral deficiency. The visit of inspection, too, may be paid at a time when, from temporary causes, there is disorder in the foster-home, and if the inspector's knowledge of cottage life is not wide enough for this to be recognised as a chance occurrence, it may be recorded in the report as a permanent condition.

Another difficulty in official inspection lies in the distance separating the districts to be visited. Each fresh village with its foster-homes is a new *terra incognita.* It is impossible for the inspector to stay long enough in any one place to obtain accurate knowledge of the neighbourhood and the foster-parents; yet without such accuracy he may be led entirely astray.

The impulse of a conscientious officer would perhaps be to try and gain local knowledge as quickly as possible, by making inquiries among the foster-parents' neighbours high and low. This at once opens the flood-gates of gossip, and those who know our poor, especially our country poor, will recognise what that means. The inspector will have to listen to rambling involved statements, made all the longer and more obscure from the natural desire to impress a stranger. These tedious stories will be garnished with a 'nice derangement of epitaphs' as wonderful as Mrs. Malaprop's, while local surnames (which are generally somewhat limited) will be used indiscriminately without explanation, and thus statements are pretty sure to attach themselves in the hearer's mind to the wrong individuals. Added to this, there is sometimes the risk of spite and

ill-natured animus in neighbourly information. Yet supposing such an animus to be suspected, to reject all that is said, and to be satisfied with one's own estimate of moral and sanitary conditions formed in one or two visits, might seem to be contentment with mere surface judgment and the neglect of information which ought to be accepted. The Certified Committee, however, is always at hand for reference in cases of doubt, which its familiarity with the neighbourhood, the foster-parents, and the children may enable it at once to clear up, the inspector of course being free to judge, from the way in which it does its work, to what extent its explanation may be trusted.

Recurring to the need we have pointed out of local knowledge, we incline to believe that the best inspectors of Boarding-out will be found in the Local Government Board inspectors of schools for the respective districts in which it exists, and who have become acquainted with the standard of living and characteristics of the inhabitants. As we are strongly of opinion that women should share the inspection of schools, giving their attention to the departments coming especially within that 'sphere' of which we hear so often, but from which, if outside their own doors, women have been hitherto generally excluded, the staff we contemplate would afford an inspector of either sex, as the circumstances of the case might demand.

In what way the various Certified Committees can best accomplish their work depends on local and other circumstances, of which each must judge for itself; but it is their obvious duty to fulfil strictly the regulations of the Order by which they have bound themselves in applying to the Local Government Board for their authority to act, and to maintain the efficiency in number and working power of their members. Equally with the inspector the Committee must avoid, collectively or individually, becoming a court of appeal against parental authority in the foster-home, or by word or deed impairing the filial respect of the child. If the parents accept the labour and responsibility of the relationship, they must also be endowed with its rights and powers; and if not worthy of the trust, the child

must be removed from their keeping. Supervision must, then, be as quiet and unobtrusive as possible, though not therefore the less vigilant. Experience shows that over-inspection and fuss are apt to excite feelings of rebellion and self-importance in the child, leading to disobedience and failure of due deference to the foster-parents. To aid it to forget its alien birth and to merge it in the foster-family is a cardinal principle in Boarding-out. Many years before a special inspector was appointed (in 1886), and when managers of Boarding-out had to be a law unto themselves, they perceived the mischief resulting from over-visitation, and eschewed whatever would give the children reason to suppose themselves objects of exceptional observation.[1]

The payments to foster-parents, whether by relieving officer or voluntary visitor, should not be made in the child's presence, or with its cognisance, if this can be helped. If it cannot, the transaction should be so effected as not to touch the child's love and gratitude for parental care. If the feeling expressed by the workhouse girl who told her nurse she was paid for cleaning dirty heads found its way into the mind of the boarded-out child, woe to its chance of benefit in the foster-home.

It is clear that inspectors and Committees should act in harmony with the best feelings of the foster-parents, and certainly with each other, the welfare of the children being their common object. By interchanging the experience of details possessed by the Committee with the general knowledge gained from a wider area of observation by the inspector, defects may be eliminated and improvements communicated throughout the country; and thus may be gradually perfected a system which in many places has not yet passed beyond the tentative stage.

Inspection by Guardians themselves of children under the care of Committees is inexpedient, and not even recognised in the Order. In the extreme case of continued neglect on the part of a Committee to visit and report, Guardians are instructed to withdraw the children, or to

[1] *Practical Guide to the Boarding-out System*, by Colonel Grant, R.E., *ex officio* Guardian for Bath Union. Knight & Co., 90 Fleet Street, 1870.

appoint an officer of their own to visit once in six weeks. But so strong evidently was the reluctance of the Department to sanction this extra-committee visitation that some years ago it refused permission to a Board of Guardians to appoint their clerk for this purpose when they had reason to believe some of their children were not cared for in the best manner, though satisfactory reports came in regularly. The well-known reputation of the officer in question for sagacity, discretion, and benevolence leaves no doubt that deep-seated conviction of the inexpediency of such visitation dictated a refusal where consent would have created a dangerous precedent. The Local Government Board sent instead one of its own inspectors. His report on the whole was good; but in two cases he found something amiss which, on being pointed out, was speedily remedied.[1]

Closely connected with inspection and supervision is the question whether the inspectors' reports to the Local Government Board should be open to other eyes. We have seen that what is, in fact, the inspection of family life, sometimes leading to inquiry into its most private affairs, may involve the duty of reporting facts and deductions which it would be a violation of honour to make public. The Local Government Board, by the exercise of discrimination, can prevent wrong accruing. It can act, if needful, and keep its motive secret. But under the present arrangement copies of the reports are transmitted to the Boards of Guardians concerned. Their meetings are usually open to the public, and attended by representatives of the press; and, moreover, whatever is there presented is *ipso facto* published. Secrecy, therefore, however much the Guardians generally or the discreet among them may desire to preserve it, is at an end. The names and addresses of foster-parents and children are with some Boards printed as a matter of course on the Agenda Paper, which easily finds its way outside the doors of the Board-room, and if the subject has raised a lively debate they are pretty sure to appear in the local newspapers. One disastrous consequence is that

[1] *Correspondence; Whitechapel Union and Local Government Board.* Penny & Hull, Leman Street, E., 1882.

relatives, from whom complete and permanent separation may be vital to the children's welfare, can find them out, to the annoyance of the foster-parents and perhaps ruin of the children. Cases are frequent in which the class miscalled 'friends' ought not to have the slightest clue to the children's whereabouts.

Another lamentable consequence arises from the erroneous statements and misapprehension sure to occur in debate. Wrong motives, neglect of duty, even actual cruelty, may be mistakenly, and without any intention to transgress the truth, imputed to Committees and to foster-parents—we have known instances of both. In these days of an omnipresent press the reports penetrate even to remote homes, and cause poignant and unmerited suffering to the foster-parents—suffering the more acute that every member of their little public is cognisant of the imputations cast upon them, and that they feel themselves powerless to disabuse the minds of their accusers, who may live a hundred miles away.

An evil, quite distinct from those already pointed out, may spring from the Guardians taking action upon the inspector's report without communication with the Certified Committee, whose responsibility for the well-being of the children should be punctiliously upheld as long as the children are left in its charge. We know an instance in which the foster-parents spontaneously refused to take any more children from a Board which sent an inspecting party without reference to the Committee.

It can hardly be doubted that to have three different authorities, not representing an ascending scale of dignity (as we shall by and by see is the French method), but resembling rather an unequal triangle, all inspecting the unlucky foster-parents and probably misapprehending each other, must cause detriment to the system, with the risk of checking its extension, and possibly leading to its decline and even extinction. It will discourage ladies from engaging in the work, and thus deprive it of their unpaid but invaluable service; and it will irritate and dishearten foster-parents, especially those who take the children from dis-

interested motives, thereby hindering the best class from applying, and by thus diminishing the safeguards of the plan, will deter Guardians from sending children.

It is sometimes urged against the adoption of Boarding-out at all, that it does not apply to every child for whom Guardians have to provide. The same objection may certainly be raised against every method of dealing with them, but we maintain that the elastic character of this system makes it more widely applicable than any other. The mentally or physically afflicted are by many persons believed to be necessarily excluded from its benefits. There could not be a greater mistake. The dull and half-witted, who are a dead weight in the large pauper school, becoming more and more stunted in mind as the years go on, have such small faculties as they possess developed and made the most of under kindly individual influences; while the excitability inherited from insane parents subsides under happy and soothing surroundings. A little fellow, the sickly inmate of a workhouse ward, feeble, dumb, and unable to walk, all symptoms as it was supposed of idiocy, was removed some four years ago to a country home and a loving foster-mother. He gradually acquired the power of speech and motion, and after some time began to attend the village school. His small attainments are the wonder and pride of his foster-family, who would feel, if he were taken from them, that they had lost the central object of their affections.

A woman who had asked for a child to adopt after the death of her own little one, was persuaded to take one disfigured with disease. On first seeing it her husband exclaimed, 'You can never love *that* child!' He consented, however, to her retaining it, and, as might have been foretold, the very care, anxiety, and self-sacrifice the little thing's condition entailed roused their deepest affection. They were repaid by her becoming a fairly strong and healthy child. In another case the workhouse schoolmistress pronounced a little boarder 'quite deficient,' but the foster-mother declares her to have a most affectionate and willing disposition, doing her housework capitally Indeed, the

child is encouraged to overcome her defective utterance by being told that to make a good servant she must be able to speak plainly.

Such instances are far too frequent to be looked upon as exceptional, but doubtless cases occur of physical infirmity or deprivation of some of the senses, and, more difficult still, of moral depravity, which make them unsuitable for care in a busy, hard-worked family. When such defects reveal themselves, and the Committee is satisfied they are beyond Boarding-out to cure, the child should if possible be transferred to a Hospital or other institution adapted to the case. An instance occurs to us in which a little girl, after reaching its foster-home, was discovered to be almost blind, and would undoubtedly have lost her sight had she been sent back to her workhouse. Yet under the treatment the Committee were able to procure for her in an Eye Hospital, she made a satisfactory recovery, and is now supporting herself in domestic service. This may be regarded as a typical case of the beneficent effect of individual interest, combined with the opportunity for bringing the most curative means to bear, which marks the gain to a sickly child in passing from the workhouse or pauper school to the charge of an influential voluntary Committee. Changing a child from a home where it has been a square peg in a round hole, is found successful in checking faults and promoting good behaviour —a different climate or soil, too, may be thus obtained, often of great importance for very delicate children. It happens sometimes with boarded-out, as with other young people living in the world, that they get associated with those who will do them harm, and to be able at once to remove them to a distance may make all the difference of success or failure in their lives.

These advantages, however, are only at the command of large Committees, and hence we find that, while willing to take any cases offered, they very rarely return children to the workhouse; the Committee of two or three persons working over a small area has not these alternative resources, and though it picks and chooses its children to suit the scanty variety of homes at its disposal, is yet com-

pelled to return a larger proportion than the more extended and powerful organisation. It may be supposed that as Committees now exist in most parts of England, it must be easy to obtain the change of conditions we have indicated by transferring a child from one Committee to another. But this is a complicated and tedious process, involving an Agreement between the Guardians of the child's parish and the Committee to which it is proposed to send it, which must have the sanction of the Local Government Board. Practically, the child is much more likely to be returned to its workhouse than for the troublesome proceedings indicated to be taken in its behalf.

Although it may be urged that Boarding-out is a failure in regard to children who are sent back to the workhouse, as well as to those whom it declines to deal with, yet it must be remembered that these do but fall into the class which would never leave the workhouse did Boarding-out not exist.

In New South Wales a method has been devised which we hope may be extensively adopted here. Very small Homes, in which specially healthful and moralising conditions are secured and where the life resembles as closely as possible that of a family, have been opened for children variously afflicted. Careful treatment, aided by so-far natural surroundings, is found wonderfully successful in overcoming bodily and mental defects which in children dwelling in masses are scarcely ever overgot. As soon as improved health and habits permit, they are passed into foster-homes; and many such a child is now robust and intelligent who, if left in the workhouse, would have become incurable, and a permanent burden on the State. Such a Home already exists among us in that at Highbury, described in our fourth chapter; certified under 25 and 26 Vict. c. 43, Guardians would be enabled to pay part if not the whole cost of the children maintained in them.

The advantages of Boarding-out over the big school system are well stated in one of the early Reports of the Industrial and Reformatory Schools Department in Victoria. Not only for the obvious and often-pointed-out benefits of

natural conditions and home life, the Department has also adopted Boarding-out, it says, because under it children are not subjected to the danger of infectious skin diseases and ophthalmia, and that by it, and it alone, they have the opportunity of replacing those protectors and friends of whom they have been deprived through no fault of their own. We would add that it confers indirect benefits not to be overlooked, though perhaps never anticipated, in the original plan. Official authority is only bound to consider the actual good to the children themselves and the respective cost of the two schemes; but others may be permitted to rejoice in the extension of a method which, in addition, forms a natural tie between different classes, which helps to raise the self-respect and develop the many excellent qualities of our less highly-placed neighbours, which impresses on us all the moral and material advantage of home life, and emphasises to all of us the legitimate connection between individual effort and individual success.

CHAPTER VII

STATE CHILDREN IN THE UNITED STATES

'The home, the family, are the best nursery for all Children, and a poor home is almost always better than a good almshouse.'—FRANCIS SANBORN, late Secretary to the State Board of Charities, Massachusetts.

'The family is God's reformatory.'—C. L. BRACE.

'If I have dwelt long upon the little part of our species, let it plead my excuse to say, I cannot view a human being, however diminutive in stature, or oppressed in fortune, without considering *I view an equal.*'—WILLIAM HUTTON.

WE are so accustomed to think of America as a land of promise in all the vigour of youth, with resources seemingly unlimited, that it is almost startling to find there is already alarm lest hereditary pauperism, the curse of older nations, should fasten on her young energies. Prompt and effective action has, however, been taken to arrest the growing evil. Among the labourers to this end scattered over the vast area of the United States may be mentioned the late Dr. E. C. Wines, author of *Child-Saving Institutions*,[1] a subject to which, besides that of reformatory treatment for adults, he devoted his enlightened and most benevolent mind. In connection with New York the names of Charles Loring Brace, of the Children's Aid Society, and Miss Louisa Lee Schuyler, founder of the State Charities Aid Society, are prominent, while Francis Sanborn is one of many workers in behalf of neglected children in Massachusetts. Miss Schuyler's Society strives to make aid helpful without being

[1] *The State of Prisons and of Child-Saving Institutions in the Civilised World*, by E. C. Wines, D.D., LL.D., Cambridge, U.S.A. John Wilson & Son, 1880.

injurious, having, like our own Charity Organisation Society, early realised the fact that one fertile source feeding the stream of pauperism is the indiscriminate almsgiving without inquiry and without personal exertion, by means of which people lazily indulge their feelings of compassion. In its Report, dated March 1st, 1873, the pertinent question is put, 'How best can we most wisely and effectually diminish this evil?' *i.e.* pauperism. Two remedies are proposed; the first is to exact such work from the able-bodied paupers as shall pay for their maintenance; the second, relating to our own subject, is full of significance:—'The other measure referred to, and to which we have lately been giving much earnest thought, is the removal of children from the County Poorhouse. It is almost inevitable that a child born a pauper, growing up with paupers, associating solely with them, should himself become a pauper. It is not an unusual thing to find three generations of paupers in our County Poorhouses. But take the child away, remove him from these evil influences; if diseased, place him in some hospital Home; if well, find a home for him in some kind-hearted family, and he is saved,—saved from what is worse than death.'[1]

This conviction was doubtless strengthened by a Report upon the condition of the inmates of an institution for the destitute children of New York, on Randall's Island, which reads, in many particulars, like an account of our own pauper children in a workhouse of past days. The number in the nursery and nursery hospital was estimated at 769. They varied in age (from two to sixteen), and almost as much in origin. The ascertained nationality of the fathers of 23 and of the mothers of 25 was English; the fathers of 2 and mothers of 3, Scotch; of 220 the fathers, and of 246 the mothers were Irish; of 128 the fathers, and of 136 the mothers, belonged to the United States; the fathers of 61 and the mothers of 49 were German; of 2 the parents were French; of 1, Italian; the parents of 21 were from other countries, and the nationality of 287 was not known.

Two hundred of the children were nominally maintained

[1] *Report of the State Charities Aid Association.* New York, 1873.

by their parents, these having agreed to pay either all or part of their board. Only one half of them, however, kept their promise. 'Poor and worthy families becoming impoverished, and looking upon Randall's Island as a refuge for their children, in view of the respectability thrown round it by official sanction, had unsuspectingly placed their children under the unhappy influences which surround them here, learning only too late, perhaps, that a deadly virus had infected the innocent nature of their offspring.'[1]

No classification but that of age was attempted, and the children were under the immediate care of a staff of pauper nurses, or, worse still, of nurses brought from the prison at Blackwell's Island, after conviction for disorderly conduct or drunkenness. The usual scourge of such establishments, ophthalmia, had attacked the children, causing blindness in several cases, and suffering in many more. The comment on this is so pathetic that we cannot refrain from giving it: 'We read of a boy prince pleading on his knees before his keeper that his eyes might not be put out with red-hot irons; and that his cruel tormentor, looking into those beautiful windows of the soul, lost heart to perform his fearful commission. The bare mention even of such a horrid conception causes the cheek to burn with indignation; but it is believed, that here, in the 19th century, at one of the few central points of the wealth and civilisation of a continent, we find an evil tolerated that permits the light of day to be shut out for ever from the eyes of orphan children. This sounds strange, and yet it is no nursery tale, but an ugly fact.

'It is deemed proper to say that any system which needlessly exposes a single child, whether it be an orphan or the offspring of honest poverty, or even a child of misfortune, to the deprivation of its sight, should not only not be tolerated, but be so entirely displaced that the memory of so great an act of inhumanity might be utterly forgotten.'[2]

The education at the institution was reported defective, and no systemised efforts were made to place the children

[1] *Ninth Annual Report of the State Board of Charities of New York, relating to Pauper Children*, by W. P. Letchworth, 1876. [2] *Ibid.*

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

out at service. Any applicant who wanted a child for service, and could obtain an order, went to the nursery and selected one who seemed likely to suit. Four months' trial was allowed, after which the child could be returned if not liked. 'It is believed,' says the Report, 'that this privilege is not unfrequently availed of by parties who merely desire to obtain the service of a child during pressure of work.'

It is the generally expressed opinion of the Managers, that the returning of a child, only a few times even, to the Asylum, greatly injures it. Some go so far as to say that it ruins it. Here we come upon the proverbial evils in every poorhouse system, from which that of New York cannot be regarded as an exception, the facility, namely, with which children may repeatedly be admitted and discharged. 'After going in and coming out a few times, a don't-care feeling takes hold of the child, and it loses whatever self-reliance of character it may have possessed.'[1]

Happily the wrongs thus exposed were remedied soon after the issue of the report: they are referred to here to show that the evils of big pauper establishments are inherent in the very principles of such institutions, and repeat themselves with unvarying and painful monotony in various parts of the world.

In contrast to this report on the children, suffering, depressed, and worse than useless, on Randall's Island, we have the account of the Children's Aid Society, which places its little charges in homes in the far West, under the able and devoted administration of its secretary, Mr. C. L. Brace. The scheme is in a sense a combination of Boarding-out and emigration, but the children here have not to cross the ocean nor are they paid for in their new homes. They are sent, boys and girls, to foster-parents in the Western States, where they are cheerfully received without payment, so that the expenses of the Society are those only of office, travelling, and outfit.

A like plan was adopted some years ago by the Managers of the New York Juvenile Asylum. The high rate of labour in the United States, making children con-

[1] *Ibid.*

stituents of wealth, is favourable to its success: and in households to which none have been born, they are gladly received as well for the industrial help they can give as from more kindly motives, and there is abundant evidence to show that the young people are, as a rule, treated on an equality with the other members of the family. Supervision, as far as possible, is exercised by the officers of the Society, and a gratifying circumstance occurred in the State of Illinois in the voluntary formation of several Associations to watch over the children who might be sent into their neighbourhood.

To enable the reader to judge of the spirit which animates Mr. Brace's work we cannot do better than quote his own striking and eloquent words: 'The children of the poor are not essentially different from the children of the rich; the same principles which influence the good or evil development of every child in comfortable circumstances will affect, in greater or less degree, the child of poverty. Sympathy and hope are as inspiring to the ignorant girl as to the educated; steady occupation is as necessary for the street boy as the boy of a wealthy house; indifference is as chilling to the one class as to the other; the prospect of success is as stimulating to the young vagrant as to the student in the college. . . . The grand truth more and more forces itself upon us that each poor, deserted, unfortunate little creature in the streets is an *individual* like no other being whom God has created. He has his own tastes, his own habits, his peculiar temptations, his special weaknesses; and his own virtues. We may class him from certain external resemblances with a hundred, or a thousand, other lads, and yet he is still distinct and individual. Perhaps one grand distinction of man from all other animals, and the pledge of his immortality, is his individuality; or the infinite variety which the Creator has impressed upon his nature, and which makes it impossible ever absolutely to include him within the machinery of a system.'[1]

Judging from the Society's Report, we should say Mr.

[1] *The Best Method of Disposing of our Pauper and Vagrant Children*, C. L. Brace. 1859, New York.

Brace's desire that the individuality of the children should be developed has been fully gratified. Their published letters show a curious mixture of shrewdness and simplicity, recalling some of Bret Harte's characters, only luckily the element of picturesque scampishness is absent. The inspector of the children placed in the far West reports that one acute youth invested eleven dollars on the 4th of July in an ice-cream and lemonade stand, and cleared a net profit of thirty-two dollars, 'besides taking the premium in the day's Hoodlum Carnival as a hyena ably personated.' Other boys write of 'real and personal property,' of buying their claims, of losses, investments, gains; and the tone is uniformly manly and plucky. One young fellow who had done well and married, boasts a 'good mother-in-law weighing 200 pounds,' an original way of estimating such a relation. He has married, he says, her last girl, and as she is so big 'this leaves her in bad shape,' and he begs the Society to send a girl to help her, promising in return kindness and a good home. He asks for inquiries to be made for his own mother, from whom he has heard nothing since he was twelve. This touching desire to hear of long-lost relations reveals itself in many of the letters, sometimes to lead to cruel disappointment, but now and then to be gratified by a happy reunion. One letter begins with tender raptures over the coming delight of finding mother, father, and sister after twenty years' severance. The writer yearns to see them, 'no matter how poor they are, so they are upright and honest.' She would fly to them—only business is very brisk just now; so she contents herself with begging them to kiss themselves for her. One young man of restless disposition, describing his many wanderings, says: 'I don't like Kansas; it runs to extremes in its weather.' Another writes sadly: 'I haven't got anything except a good wife and a nice little girl 28 months old. My moving around so much explains my not haveing (*sic*). It is a business [a nursery garden business he had taken up] that I don't like very well, for I am not naturally a big talker, but, of course, we can't all have our likes. I would rather have a business that I can grow up faster in.'

The accounts of the Girls' Lodging-Houses in New York, and their Summer Home near the sea on Long Island, are full of interest and practical hints. It may give some idea of the class of children often taken charge of when we say that one girl, until befriended by the Society, had never received any religious teaching whatever, and only knew the name of Jesus as an oath.[1]

In 1853, when the Children's Aid Society began its work, it wanted homes only for 207 boys. Its latest Return gives 85,890 as the whole number of persons it had placed out.[2] A small proportion were destitute labouring families, many paying a portion of the cost, but the very large majority were children, 'nearly all of whom,' to use the words of Dr. Wines, 'have been saved for a life of virtuous industry and good citizenship.'

Soon after the commencement of the civil war in America, another institution of similar character, The Howard Mission, arose in New York for the relief of destitute children and for other charitable purposes. It has placed out in foster-homes very many thousands of children, almost all of whom were immigrants, or the offspring of foreigners, chiefly German and Irish, sunk in the depths of poverty or vice; and very touching letters show how thoroughly they have become the adopted children of the families they have entered. The Rev. C. Vanmeter, the founder of the Mission, visited England some years ago, and preaching in several large towns, obtained considerable donations. We give the concluding passages of a letter sent by him to the Master of S. James's Back Ragged School, at Bristol, from which institution he had taken two boys. 'This placing out of infants and small children in orphan asylums and work-houses, and dooming them to spend several years in them, is a shame to Christianity. That community has arrived at a very low standard of charity that shuts its dwellings against these little ones, no matter how richly endowed may be its benevolent institutions. *Money* is the lowest type of representing charitable feeling.'

[1] *Reports of the Children's Aid Society for* 1885-7. New York: Wynkoop, Hallenbeck, & Co.

[2] *Ibid*, 1888.

So alive, indeed, have Americans become of late years to the evils which arise from the massing together of children that they have invented a word to describe its effects, and when they speak of a child being 'institutionalised,' they mean to express that it is mechanical and helpless from the effect of asylum life. The beginning of the end, however, of such institutions throughout the land was sighted when the efforts of Miss Schuyler, in co-operation with the State Charities Aid Association, obtained an Act, passed in April 1875 by the New York State Legislature (Chap. 173 of the Law of 1875), which forbids the committal of any child over three and under sixteen as vagrant, truant, or disorderly, to any County Poorhouse of the State, and provides that such child shall be sent to some Reformatory or other suitable institution, or be placed in a family. And farther, the same Act ordered the removal on or before January 1st, 1876, of all children, with some special exceptions, from the poorhouses to the institutions beforementioned.[1]

Meanwhile the members of the Children's Committees of the Association had prepared for the coming law by passing a resolution 'pledging themselves . . . to secure suitable homes in private families for all children of sound mind and body now in the poorhouses, almshouses, and other public institutions of this State, or that hereafter may come into them—homes where the children shall be carefully trained and fitted to become respectable and self-supporting citizens.'[2] When, however, the nursery on Randall's Island was broken up in accordance with the new law, and its little inmates dispersed, it was found that one fourth of those entered on the books as healthy and fit for adoption were suffering from diseases inseparable from poorhouse life, and, instead of being placed in foster-homes, had to be transferred to the Hospital; the diseases were chiefly of the skin, and ophthalmia. Such is constantly our experience at home when the first selection of children for Boarding-out is made at the workhouse or pauper school.

[1] 'Suggestions for the Use of Committees on Children.' *Report of the State Charities Aid Association.* New York, 1875.

[2] *Ibid.*

It is a grievous disappointment to learn from the latest Report of Miss Schuyler's Association that though the legislation it obtained seems to be fairly obeyed in the letter—that is, in keeping dependent children out of the State poorhouses—its spirit appears to have been forgotten, and comparatively few are restored to family life.

Some years previously the danger of miscarriage in the fulfilment of the intention of the law had been pointed out by an able protest against incorporating a Home for destitute children, which was actually to be built on the grounds of the poorhouse and partly managed by its governing body —constituting, in fact, a pauper school.[1] But the warning seems to have had little effect.

'Destitute children,' says the Report of 1887, 'have so accumulated in New York city that in 1885 there were upwards of nineteen thousand in the charge of institutions there. Yet,' it continues, 'there is absolutely no one to look after the interests of the city and county in all these children whom it supports. The children are supposed to be in the institutions, but whether they actually are, whether they are rightfully dependent upon the city, whether they could not and ought not to be supported by their parents . . . whether they are properly treated or wisely educated, or what steps, if any, are taken to make them self-supporting, no city or county official knows, and it is not believed that any one of them has any power to find out.'[2]

It appears that the city pays two dollars weekly for each child, which makes them profitable to the institutions, and no control over these is exercised by the public. The association sees no remedy but a radical reform of the administration of the Charities and correctional institutions of New York, and is endeavouring to get this view accepted. In proof of its conviction it publishes Tables prepared by one of its Committees showing the increase of children in

[1] *Reasons against the Passage of the Bill entitled 'An Act to Incorporate the Homes for Destitute Children of Suffolk County,'* by William P. Letchworth, Chairman of the Committee of the State Board of Charities on Dependent and Delinquent Children. 1883.

[2] *Fifteenth Annual Report of the State Charities Aid Association*, Dec. 1887. New York.

the State institutions from 1868 to 1887—and very startling it is, especially when compared with the opposite movement in Massachusetts which we have hereafter to describe. In 1868 there were in the State of New York, exclusive of King's and New York counties, which are not reported on, 1566 juvenile inmates of Protestant, and 1704 of Roman Catholic institutions; by 1878 these numbers had risen to, respectively, 2269 and 3215. A further Return for the years 1883, 1884, and 1885, shows that about a fifth had been yearly sent back to parents or guardians, and only about one-thirtieth were disposed of by adoption or indenture.[1] We infer that the remainder spent their young lives within institution walls until the age for discharge; but this is not actually stated, and we hope our inference is a mistaken one.

The laws of Massachusetts concerning children have attracted especial attention from their originality and boldness. 'The Probationary System' of that State, more familiarly known here as the Massachusetts Plan, assumes legal powers over-riding those of the parent, which may startle English people accustomed to so large a liberty, not to say license, in the exercise of paternal authority; but it has assuredly wrought great benefit to the children and through them to the community. The same beneficent spirit which dictated this plan is observable in other legislation, some provisions of which, with reference to impure literature, selling intoxicating drinks to children (who are not allowed to purchase even for their parents' use) and their performance in public, we wish might be adopted here. It was evidently under one of the latter that little Josef Hoffmann's exhausting appearances were stopped. We return to the Probationary System.

Massachusetts opened its first reformatory school for boys (at Westborough) in 1846, and one for girls eight years later (at Lancaster), and in 1866 converted the Monson Almshouse (*Anglicé* Poorhouse) to a State Primary School, of which the inmates should be relieved of the

[1] *Ibid.*

stigma of pauperism. Much good resulted, but (before the alteration at Monson) cause for dissatisfaction arose, and the Board of State Charities, created in 1863, was invested with powers 'of investigation, of supervision, of recommendation, and of execution,' to deal with whatever might be amiss. They were not long in discovering that institution-life continued for years was injurious, and they recommended that both boys and girls should be transplanted, as soon as it could be done with safety, to genuine homes. After the organisation of the State Primary School with 500 children under one roof, the need of dispersion became still more apparent.[1] It had already been the plan to send the young people out to employment from the Reformatories as occasion offered, but without adequate care and supervision, and the Board found its first step must be to provide these. A paid visitor was appointed, succeeded in 1869 by a permanent Visiting Agency which developed into an important branch of State work. Besides visiting the wards of the State in the schools and subsequently in the homes whither they were transferred after a shorter or longer detention, duties entirely new in character now devolved upon its members. Acts, passed in 1869-70, provided that the State Agent should have notice of all complaints brought in a Court of Law against any child under 17 years of age, with opportunity to attend in person or by an assistant, and protect the interests of the child or otherwise provide for it.[2] Disobedience to parents is an offence under the Massachusetts code, and for this and other reasons children are liable to be brought before a Court by their parents, while many of the charges preferred by police officers involve, as with us, wrong-doing on the parents' side rather than the child's. Truancy and 'stubbornness,' besides more serious offences, may bring them there, and as cases of orphanage, desertion, and neglect are also decided upon by the Court, it appears to deal with every class designated children of the State.

In 1879 legislation reorganising the Charities of Massa-

[1] *Report of the Seventh Conference of Charities, U.S.A.* Paper by Mrs. Anne B. Richardson. [2] *Ibid.* Paper by Gardner Tufts.

chusetts abolished the State Board and its Visiting Agency, transferring their functions to a newly created Board of Health, Lunacy, and Charity, aided by a freshly constituted Agency having State-conferred powers. These are of great importance, governing, in fact, the future lot of every child, whether criminal, neglected, or destitute, cast upon the care of the State. It is the duty of the Head of the Agency, who holds his appointment direct from Government, to attend in person or by deputy whenever a child is brought before the Court. Mr. Joseph Sturge, in an instructive and very interesting Memorandum on the Massachusetts Plan, describes the duties performed towards the little ward, which are those of friend and counsel too—of counsel in the best sense, not bent on 'getting off' his client, but, after a full elucidation of all the circumstances, securing for him those conditions which shall enable him to grow up a useful and happy citizen.[1] Sometimes the Agent interposes in behalf of a child before it appears in Court, and by arrangement with its parents or by other means rescues it from a position of danger or misery.

We now come to the most remarkable feature of the Plan. At the request of the Agent a Judge or Magistrate is empowered to commit any person under the age of 17 convicted before him, to the charge of the Board of Health, Lunacy, and Charity until it shall attain the age of 21, but with authority to discharge it at any time. The Board is invested with corresponding powers in great variety whereby to deal with the child thus placed under its care. (1) It may be left, with a warning and under supervision, with its parent, who is usually fined in a small sum for costs; but power is retained to remove the child in case of non-improvement. Thus its continuance at home becomes a period of wholesome probation to both child and parent. About four-fifths of the 75 per cent of children committed are thus returned to their parents, and a very small proportion of these in after years reappear in the Courts to be more severely dealt with. (2) If removal from the parent be deemed necessary, the Board can send the child to the

[1] *Report, Destitute Act Commission, South Australia*, Appendix. 1885.

State Primary School, which is not a criminal institution Magistrates having no power to commit to it; or (3) to a Reformatory, or (4) even to gaol (but the latter alternative is rarely resorted to); and thence to homes when such transference seems desirable. Or (5) it may be, like the orphan or destitute child, boarded-out with payment, or (6) placed out without payment according to circumstances, very great care being exercised in selecting the homes, whether of employers or foster-parents. (7) Orphans may be placed on adoption, but only after trial. (8) The Board can also appoint a Guardian to a child; the Guardian thenceforth possessing over it, until the age of twenty-one, full parental power, to the nullifying of the power of its real parents if it possess them.[1]

As the Board consists of unpaid members, both ladies and gentlemen, living in different parts of the State, and does not meet frequently, its executive duties are performed by its agents, who are thus the immediate arbiters of the children's fate.[2] Very high testimony to the zeal and intelligence of the Agency is given by writers upon the system; and so valuable have its services proved with regard to children, that Massachusetts several years ago created a similar Agency to deal with adults, which is likewise of great use.

In addition to the wise conception of placing all children needing State discipline or protection or maintenance under the authority of one Department empowered to consider each case individually, and deal with it according to its special characteristics, an Act of 1869-70 directs that Courts shall be cleared for the hearing of children's cases; if the presence of the police is in any instance necessary, they are kept in the background. Thus are these young creatures lifted out of the criminal as well as the pauper class, and Massachusetts throws off the disgrace of branding her little ones with shame for acts for which they are not responsible.

Although by 1879 the State Agency, owing to the pressure of its many duties, had been able to provide for only one visit a year to each child under its care, so bene-

[1] Gardner Tufts.

[2] Two ladies and six gentlemen now constitute the Board. They appear to be appointed for fixed periods, but of different length.—*Ninth Annual Report of the Board of Health, Lunacy, and Charity.* Boston, 1888.

ficial was the treatment these received, that by the end of the first ten years of its existence there were 'three hundred fewer juvenile offenders under State care in Massachusetts than in 1870, notwithstanding the increase of population in the decade. The two school ships have been given up as reformatories, and sold. The number of children in the reformatories and industrial schools has also *diminished by fifty per cent.* And, meanwhile, there have been *very few* juvenile committals to prisons. The criminal and neglected children of the State cost upwards of £10,000 (52,000 dols.) more in 1869 than ten years later, in 1879.'[1]

In 1880 the Board began to board-out destitute foundlings, and the effect after a few years shows itself in three ways—in a decrease in the number thrown upon the State, in greater success in tracing their parentage, which also tends to diminish the public burden, and in an increase of applications from good foster-parents. Up to three years old they are under close medical supervision; but we suppose infant life is more fragile in the United States than with us, both because professional supervision is considered necessary, and that, notwithstanding this and other special regulations for the protection of health, including, as the Report informs us, investigation concerning the 'sunlight, drainage, ventilation, milk, and water supply, etc.,' of a foster-home before its acceptance, the mortality is very high compared with that of pauper infants boarded-out under careful supervision in the United Kingdom.[2]

Besides medical inspectors for the infants, and four male and two female paid visitors for the rest, the State Agency is assisted in its important and delicate duties by 'auxiliary visitors,' ladies scattered over not only Massachusetts, but Vermont, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, where some of the Massachusetts children are located.[3] These voluntary

[1] 'The Treatment of our Juvenile Offenders:' by the Right Hon. Sir Walter Crofton, *Good Words*, July 1881. The information concerning the results of the Massachusetts Plan is quoted by Sir W. Crofton, from a Report by the Howard Association.

[2] *Report of the State Board of Lunacy and Charity*, 1888.

[3] An interesting Paper by Miss E. C. Putnam of Boston describes the duties of the Auxiliary Visitors and the general work of the Agency.

workers are not self-appointed. 'Some leading man in each district,' says Mr. Joseph Sturge, who several years ago made a special visit to Massachusetts to watch the working of the Probationary system, 'is privately asked to point out one or more ladies of good position whose judgment may be relied upon, and who would be likely to undertake and carry out efficiently the duty of supervising the girls on behalf of the State. If they assent, they are officially appointed Auxiliary Visitors, and . . . they obtain a distinct status of authority and responsibility. The girls are instructed that although strict obedience to all reasonable demands of their employers is required, they yet have the liberty of appeal to the visitor in cases of a real or fancied wrong.'[1]

The Board has, since the date of Mr. Sturge's visit, invited ladies to visit the boys who are placed out, and thus, while more visitors are wanted, it finds additional organisation also needed. It 'appreciates the work of the Auxiliary Visitors, whose services it solicited in 1880 in behalf of the Children of the State, and has no desire to substitute for their disinterested labours a system of visiting merely by salaried persons. If left entirely to them, this might sink into work "perfunctorily discharged with dull and ineffective routine." In order, however, to make the voluntary work more effective, the Board proposes to appoint a special visitor (a woman) who shall receive a salary and shall devote her whole time to the investigation of homes, to the visitation of those who are placed out; and to communication with the Auxiliary Visitors, the adjustment of difficulties arising between employers and employés, and the many exigencies which seem to demand that immediate and authoritative attention which it is not always within the province of the voluntary visitor to give.'[2]

While laying stress on the benefit to the children, and pecuniary advantage to the country, of sending forth the children into families, 'it is possible,' say the Board, 'in

[1] *Report of Commission on Destitute Act* (South Australia), Appendix, 1885. [2] *Report of the State Board of Charity and Lunacy*, 1888.

the case of vicious girls and boys, to carry this policy too far, and to send into families young persons whose character unfits them for any place except a well-disciplined reformatory or prison.'[1] The need for this warning will be understood when it is remembered that young persons up to the age of 17 are committed to the care of the Board, and that some of these are already initiated in vice and crime. A paper read at one of the series of Conferences to which we have already referred, entitled 'The Shady Side of the "Placing-out System,"' by Mr. Alden, Superintendent of an Orphan Home, dwells upon this danger, and also points out that a large proportion of cottages are unfit for the reception of children. 'The beneficence of an apprenticing agency is not attested,' says a writer he quotes, well experienced in placing-out in Illinois, 'by the number of children which it disposes of. It is not quantity but quality that determines the real excellence of its work. It would be an easy matter for us to place a thousand children annually in homes, in the Western States, if nothing more than that were required. But of all the outrages that have been perpetrated in the name of Christian charity, none is more reprehensible than that of leaving helpless children without recourse, in such situations.'[2]

The authors and conductors of the Massachusetts Plan are fully alive to the demand for caution and constant watchfulness in behalf of the children for whose welfare they are responsible, and seem never weary of devising improvements. For instance, the earnings of the children at service are secured to their own possession more or less successfully by the Board, but it is not satisfied with the existing arrangements to this end, and it hopes to improve them during the current year.[3]

Let us now consider the results of 20 years' application of the Probationary System. In 1867 there were in the Reformatories and State Primary School 1340 children, costing 205,735 dollars; in 1887 the children were

[1] *Report of the State Board of Charity and Lunacy*, 1888.

[2] *Report of the Twelfth Annual Conference of Charities.* Boston, 1885. This volume contains many valuable Papers on reformatory and preventive work.

[3] *Report*, 1888.

reduced to 504, costing 82,637 dollars. In one Reformatory the numbers had sunk from 179 to nil.[1] In 1887 there were, besides, 1060 children in families, of whom 534 had been 'juvenile offenders,' under detention at Westborough and Lancaster. Of the 1060 only 161 were on payment, the rest costing nothing to the State except for supervision; deducting this item from the expense that would have accrued from maintaining them in schools, the saving in placing them outside is 100,000 dollars.[2] We do not find the cost given of those in gaol, but the number is stated to be very small.

Thus, with a population approaching two millions,[3] the State of Massachusetts has only 1564 criminal and dependent children, of whom one half cost her nothing but for supervision, a large part of which is performed gratuitously; and they are dealt with under a system which rapidly merges them in the honest and self-supporting community.[4]

We cannot pretend here to do justice to all the child-saving organisations of the United States; the subject demands such a volume as the late Dr. Wines's bulky but deeply interesting work, instead of a single chapter in a small book. But with sincerest admiration we recognise the enlightened and truly hopeful solicitude long active in America for her State children, while we regret that zeal should ever flag, as the information we have quoted from the Report of the State Charities Aid Association makes too certain it has done of late years in the State of New York.

But looking to the future in well-grounded faith we see that great country employing, when needful, the disciplinary means afforded by special schools and Reformatories, but more and more vividly realising the true philosophy of the homely proverb, 'prevention is better than cure,' and gathering the neglected and parentless under her wing from the length and breadth of her land to restore them to the healthful conditions of home life.

[1] *Report*, 1888. [2] *Ibid.* p. lxxxv.

[3] At the Census of 1880 the population of Massachusetts was 1,783,085.

[4] Children under the care of private individuals or societies are not included in the above summary.

CHAPTER VIII

EXPERIENCE OF THE COLONIES

'The blessings bestowed on us by the Almighty can only be realised in proportion to the help which we are prepared to render to each other.' —SPEECH OF THE PRINCE CONSORT.

'Between infancy and maturity there is no short cut by which may be avoided the tedious process of growth and development.'—HERBERT SPENCER.

THE problem of pauperism is, no doubt, more perplexing in England than in the Colonies, where Nature is so bountiful, the land thinly peopled, and the demand for unskilled labour yet exists. Moreover, in those young and vigorous countries, the difficulty is not complicated by an elaborate, rigid, and inherited Poor Law, in some respects adapted even to defeat its own ends by checking independence, and saving the idle and worthless from the consequences of their own misdoings.

Still, even in the richly endowed continent of Australia there is extreme poverty, and the problem how best to give help and yet avoid the pauperism of older lands, is one which has occupied and continues to occupy the thoughts and energies of many of her ablest men and women.

In the absence of a Poor Law, in our sense of the word, provision is very generally made for the destitute and afflicted, either by means of charitable institutions supported by individual generosity, or by Government grants to specified establishments, or by the two agencies acting together. The grants are made from the revenues of the State in South Australia, and we believe in the sister colonies also, not from local funds.

The children left without means, and without natural protectors, or—worse still—having parents of the vicious and criminal classes, are dealt with under powers resembling those given by our Industrial and Reformatory Schools Acts, and by such voluntary and State charity as we have indicated; but the organisation under which these are administered has, within recent years, been entirely remodelled in most of the Colonies, on the lines of the Probationary System of Massachusetts, though not in exact identity with it.

The cause of committal varies almost as much as in Massachusetts. Sometimes it is mere naughtiness brought about by neglect, wandering in the streets, or other vagrancies, which might be prevented by more vigilant parental care. But there are other cases, both with boys and girls, of a much more painful kind, including the lowest vices, which need stern but judicious treatment: all these children were formerly consigned to institutions of one kind or other, and thither, too, were brought the destitute or deserted and orphaned children, who might be as innocent as children ought to be, but who were thrown indiscriminately among the rest.

These asylums reproduced in many ways the objectionable features of pauper schools in England. The children were massed together in large numbers; they had all the doubtful benefits of institution life in the shape of organised machinery and official Guardianship. They were not classified, and they were excluded from home affections and the wholesome rubs and trials, as well as pleasures, of everyday life. In some cases, also, adult paupers had access to their premises. Instead, however, of being under Guardians elected by local ratepayers, they were under the control of managers directly nominated by the Government.

The managers and those interested in the subject gradually perceived that these institution children were singularly backward and stupid, and threatened to form a distinct and hereditary class of paupers with all the characteristics of their English prototypes; namely, dependence on others, want of pluck, and shiftless and displeasing habits,

quite inconsistent with the requirements and decencies of advancing civilisation.

The adult pauper was usually, indeed, represented only by a comparatively few old people, generally accommodated in another part of the same building as the Asylum School, but classification among the children themselves, however insisted on by even the most vehement upholders of the large school system, was as usual found to be practically impossible; and children committed from the lowest haunts of metropolitan and other large towns contaminated the others, bringing into the monotonous routine of the dull school life a fearful knowledge which they soon communicated to the rest. Most painful examples to this effect are given in the Official Reports. If these evils were not to grow with the growing life of a great people, it was evident they must be nipped in the bud; and after due consideration and inquiry the inhabitants of Australia generally have almost unanimously adopted the plan of boarding-out in foster-homes not only their 'dependent' but also their neglected and delinquent children, in the same manner and by frequently the same methods as those employed for destitute children in Great Britain and Ireland, though on a more extensive scale, and with a more consistent faith in the truth and efficacy of the family principle.

The plan has forced itself on public opinion as the most efficacious for arresting the tendencies of the indolent and vicious to form themselves into a State-supported class, with hereditary interest in State aid; and, fortunately, there were neither local prejudices nor time-honoured custom to oppose it. Thus the question was not, in the younger colonies at least, complicated by under-currents of patronage, self-interest, appeals to popular prejudice, or the *vis inertiæ* of long established routine. It was recognised as a question of national importance, and discussed fairly on its own merits; and Australia and New Zealand have every reason to congratulate themselves on the far-seeing policy which bids fair to save them from the moral and financial incubus of integral pauperism. Their State and charitable organisations work together, and their action in regard to a large

proportion of the class now specially under consideration is no longer hampered by having to support costly buildings and staffs.

Though the historic development of State aid in England and the colonies differs essentially, it is curious how on both sides of the globe the same errors led to the same results; how large institutions produced the same expensive failures, and how the better methods of training the State children had to be reached through a series of mistakes—mistakes, however, more quickly rectified in the new than in the old country, as they had been of quicker growth and were less deeply rooted in the social life of the people.

In the evidence given before a Commission of inquiry in South Australia, we find an account of a big Industrial School on the barrack system, built in 1860, at Magill, near Adelaide, which might easily pass for a description of a pauper school in England, so accurately are the same features reproduced. It had contained a large number of young children and infants, referring to whom the matron said, 'They never grow properly if you have a lot of them together. I would never have children of two or three years of age there, for if they get into an institution such as that, they never develop into anything; they only grow up into half-idiotic men and women. However good a nurse you have, she cannot draw out the intelligence of every child, and nurse it as it would be nursed in a home. I think it is quite a mistake to have a lot of young children in an institution, and I do not think it is well for the school. I think it is a miserable life. . . . We have only five [the number had been thus reduced after a visit from the Commission], and they are as bright again as when we had twenty. . . . I would not have one there if I could board them out.'[1] There had been the inevitable outbreak of ophthalmia consequent on school life in close association, in this case following measles, and resulting in partial blindness in seven, and total blindness in two children. 'During the whole of our inquiry,' say the Commissioners, 'we have seen no spectacle more distressing than the sight of three or four of

[1] *Final Report of the Destitute Act Commission.* Adelaide, 1885.

those children totally, or almost totally, blind for life, the penalty of having, through no fault of their own, been detained in a government institution.'[1]

There was no classification among the children, evil and good being mixed together; and the industrial training and the teaching were very indifferent.

Among the 'Reformatory girls,' who occupied a portion of the same building, there was the same unwholesome craving for notoriety at any cost which has been pointed out as characteristic of our older workhouse girls. 'These poor creatures,' says Mr. James Smith, a magistrate of much experience, 'get fidgety, and want their former liberty. I think they then lay their heads together to have a row, so that they shall get a change.'[2] It was also stated that they were proud of being in the papers, and of their friends seeing the way they would behave before the magistrate.

The initiative experiment in Boarding-out was made long since by Miss Clark, of Hazlewood, near Adelaide. Pained to observe a pauper spirit developing among the little ones at Magill, and happening to meet with Mr. Greig's narrative of the plan pursued at Edinburgh, quoted by Miss Frances Power Cobbe in her *Philosophy of the Poor Laws*, Miss Clark was impressed with its adaptability to the circumstances of the Colony. Having ascertained that the cost would be the same as in the asylum, and found a suitable foster-home, she obtained permission from the then Chief Secretary of South Australia (Sir Arthur Blyth) to remove to it a little boy for whom it was peculiarly suitable. She was invited to select a second child, and other ladies joining in the work, eight or nine children were, in the course of a few months, thus restored to family life. The experiment proved satisfactory, and led to the introduction of a clause in the Destitute Persons Act (South Australia) of 1872, which authorised the placing-out, at a cost not exceeding five shillings per week, of any child from a reformatory or industrial school. This was the first legislative recognition in Australia of the Boarding-out system, and as

[1] *Final Report of the Destitute Act Commission.* Adelaide, 1885.
[2] *Ibid.*

the Honourable Chief Justice Way, the Chairman of the Destitute Act Commission, says in his exhaustive Report, 'marks a new epoch in the treatment of children under government control'—not in his own Colony alone, but throughout the vast continent of which it is a part.

The Destitute Asylum Board lost no time in availing itself of this new power. To the energy of its Chairman, Mr. T. S. Reed, is mainly due the rapid placing-out of children which followed. Miss Clark and her friends formed themselves into a Society to co-operate with the Board. They had no administrative powers, but lent valuable aid by visiting and periodically reporting upon the children in their foster-homes, while the admirable annual Reports of the Society were of great use in spreading information and arousing interest. The children were soon scattered over so wide an area that though the members, gentlemen as well as ladies, of the voluntary society approached a hundred in number, they had sometimes twenty miles to travel to visit their protégés.

The Act placed no limit to the class of children who should be boarded-out. All, whether orphans or having parents, who, for whatever cause, had been committed to a reformatory or industrial school, were, if under the age of twelve, eligible. Further, they might be placed out under either of these three heads: 'boarding-out on subsidy,' *i.e.* with payment; 'licensed for adoption,' *i.e.* without payment; and under apprenticeship to trades or service.

The demand for children on adoption proved so great that in a few months the Destitute Board conceived the idea of saving to the State all cost of payment for the children, and suspended the placing-out on subsidy. The economy thus effected was estimated by Mr. Reed to amount to upwards of £30,000;[1] but, as will be seen, unforeseen consequences arose which for a time affected many of the children unfavourably, and even threatened to bring genuine boarding-out into unmerited disrepute.

The great clearance effected at Magill suggested the plan also that henceforth it should be used only as a

[1] *Final Report of the Destitute Act Commission.* Adelaide, 1885.

Depôt. Committed children of all classes were to be brought here for as short a stay as possible while arrangements were made for their distribution.

Many of the children were, it cannot be doubted, taken by foster-parents from purely disinterested motives; but others only for the sake of the help they could give, and though no great abuse seems to have arisen—on the contrary, the children, as a whole, fared far better than at Magill—it was thought expedient to check this tendency by a regulation requiring that at the age of thirteen the 'adopted' child should begin to receive wages from its foster-parent. As might have been expected, this had the effect of throwing the children back on the hands of the authorities when the wage-earning age arrived. Naturally those who had given home, maintenance, and everything the child required during its early years resented having to pay under compulsion for its services when of an age to be serviceable. The demand for children on adoption slackened—very reasonably, at any rate on the part of those applicants who were not well-to-do in the world, when it became understood that by refraining to take a child for nothing it could be had on subsidy.

Moreover, the belief arose at Magill that some school discipline preparatory to placing-out would be useful for the elder children, to avoid risk of return, from their wildness and ignorance of the proprieties of life. The result was that, though placing-out was the acknowledged method of dealing with them in the end, yet a compromise was established, and the older children were kept unduly in the Depôt, the necessary work of reform being thus delayed, and every risk run of fresh evil being learnt. 'I think,' says Mrs. Colton, one of the early promoters of Colonial Boarding-out, and a witness before the Commission, 'every one must be against the system of a large institution for children. It seems to repress every kindly childish feeling. They seem to lose all interest in life up there at Magill. I suppose their love and sympathy are not drawn out.'

In reference to the lack of classification at Magill, and the consequent mischief to the children, Mr. F. R. Burton,

in his valuable evidence, says: 'My idea would be that the few bad boys would be more likely to influence the good ones than the good ones to influence the bad ones,'[1] a growing conviction among us at home, although the converse opinion, that the good children will reclaim the bad, has not unhappily quite died out.

The success of Boarding-out in South Australia was also early threatened from another side. The method employed by the Destitute Board to obtain homes was to distribute circulars inviting applications for the children, and compare the answers with a list of those waiting at the School to be placed out. An application for a boy of nine years old, for instance, would be matched by the name of one of that age, and he would be sent off without further inquiry. This extraordinary want of care in selecting both homes and children led to failures causing large numbers to be withdrawn from their homes by the Department, or returned to Magill by the foster-parents, and the Industrial School which had been retained for their temporary shelter only, became crammed with a heterogeneous population most difficult to deal with.

Mischief arose, too, from another cause, namely, from 'adoption' homes having been accepted to save the subsidy, too far from school for attendance. It was indeed stipulated that teaching should be given at home, and specimens of the children's writing be periodically transmitted to the Department; but the arrangement proved unsatisfactory, and it is not surprising it should do so.

In some few cases care had not been taken to place Roman Catholic children with foster-parents of the same faith, the result being a charge of proselytising and a remonstrance from the members of that Church; but even before this had been made, steps had been taken to remedy the negligence, for religious liberty is an integral part of the Boarding-out system. The religious question was complicated in South Australia by the singular construction put on the proviso, doubtless imported from the English Poor Law, that children of twelve and upwards shall be allowed

[1] *Final Report.*

themselves to declare to what religious body they belong, and interpreted to mean that after twelve any child might choose a religion for itself.

The form of certificate of applicants for the children, intended to ascertain the moral qualifications of the foster-parents, was often very carelessly signed, in several instances mere religious observances undertaken for effect being accepted as evidence of moral fitness.

These defects, and the crowded condition of Magill School arising from the circumstances we have described, together with an outbreak of ophthalmia urgently needing remedy, roused the earnest attention of the Colony, the result being an instruction to the Destitute Act Commission (1883) then sitting, to inquire into 'the reclamation and training of criminal and neglected children, the management of the Reformatory and Industrial Schools, and the systems of boarding and licensing out, adoption, and apprenticeship.'

The Commission discharged the duty laid upon it most ably and fully, gathering information on the various methods pursued in other countries in dealing with the children of the State, and more especially on the Boarding-out system in England, the United States, and the sister Australian Colonies, who, though later in adopting it, had developed it with more caution and elaborateness. The Minutes of Evidence and the Chairman's Report constitute a full and most instructive history of the whole subject—it might almost be said throughout the world. It is strong testimony to the soundness and vitality of the principle underlying the Boarding-out system and to the goodness and kindly feeling of the foster-parent class in South Australia, that notwithstanding the unfavourable circumstances which had arisen there in connection with it, the Evidence laid before the Commission was unanimous in its favour and against the big schools. 'I think,' says Mr. James Smith, 'as a rule the result of placing out these children during many years past has been marvellously successful, wonderfully successful [notwithstanding, it will be remembered, the comparative failure consequent on carrying adoption too

far]. When the idea was mooted, soon after I joined the Board, I did not believe it would take at all. I thought that the circumstances of the Colony and the well-doing of our people generally out on the lands would be so different from the homes that are found for a similar class of children at home in England, that the boarding-out here would be a mistake. I am very glad to find that it was I who was mistaken. I think it has been an unqualified success. . . . On the whole the country has immense reason to be gratified at the result of this boarding-out system. I have no doubt we could muster hundreds of children who would surprise anybody to see what they had been brought to by the good training of the homes that have been found for them.' [1]

Indeed Mr. Smith thought so highly of Boarding-out that even had it been more costly than the schools, he declared he would still have urged its adoption as an economy in the end. His remarks on inspection are worthy of consideration. Speaking in the highest terms of the Boarding-out inspector, Mr. Gray, he yet says—' He was too particular. . . . He speaks, for instance, of having seen holes in the children's stockings and little matters of that kind, which we do not want to inquire into. Children may be placed out in the very best homes, where they may be careless as to cleanliness. It is desirable to keep the children's heads free from vermin, and to get them well clothed and so on; but when children are placed out in the homes of poor people, such people as probably their own parents would have been, we cannot insist to the same extent on these minor matters as we would about our own children in our own homes. . . . It seems to me infinitely more important that we should be well certified as to the character of the people in the homes. . . . I do not think it is our duty to lift the children above the condition in life in which they would probably have been if they had not come into our hands.' [2] Miss Catherine Spence (Secretary to the Boarding-out Society) expresses a somewhat similar opinion, when, speaking of adoption, she

[1] *Final Report.* [2] *Ibid.*

stated that the children taken by the richer childless foster-parents were the least successful. 'The little one is often spoiled and over-dressed, and expected to be happy without childish companionship. My beau-ideal of a home,' she says, 'is where a destitute child or two, or even three, are absorbed amongst other children and go to ordinary schools and take a share in ordinary work.'[1]

The Commission, taking the Massachusetts Plan as a basis for new legislation, with such variations as the circumstances of South Australia might require, presented in its Report recommendations accordingly, and these recommendations were embodied in the 'Act to amend the "Destitute Persons Act, 1881,"' which became law in Nov. 1886. It directs that 'an honorary board under the name of the State Children's Council (hereinafter referred to as the Council), to be composed of not more than twelve persons, shall, as soon as conveniently practicable after the passing of this Act, be appointed by the Governor, which Council, in all matters appertaining to the boarding-out, licensing-out, adoption, and apprenticing of State children under this Act, shall, subject to the control of the Governor, have the care, management, and control of all Industrial Schools, Reformatory Schools, and houses of reception, herebefore appointed, or hereafter to be appointed, and shall be the authority for the boarding-out, licensing-out, adoption, or apprenticeship of all State Children, and their removal, recall, and restoration to their parents or guardians.' 'State child' is defined to mean a destitute or neglected or convicted child under the age of eighteen; and it is provided that 'all children, whether committed by Justices, or declared in any other manner a destitute, criminal, neglected, or uncontrollable child, or for any other cause, being subject to the care and control of the State, shall be committed and placed under the care of the Council, who shall have absolute authority over such child, for all the purposes of this Act.' It authorises the Council to make all prescribed regulations for the conduct of its business, disposal of the children, recovery of maintenance fees from parents,

[1] *Final Report.*

for closing Magill and other schools when the children are provided for, the opening of a House of reception, and of Cottage Homes when needed, etc. etc.—these Regulations to have the force of law as soon as approved by the Governor and duly published.

The Act provides that Courts may be cleared for the hearing of children's cases, and that an officer appointed by the Council may attend to represent them. It also provides for the protection of the children's wages and savings. It empowers the Council to receive bequests in behalf of State children, and to appoint and dismiss all officers concerned with them; directs the appropriation to it of funds by Parliamentary grant; and requires from it a Report once or oftener in every year on the working of the Act, the number of children in their different classes, and any other particulars the Chief Secretary may direct to be included, the Reports to be laid before Parliament. Due provision is given by the Act to recover from the parents of every committed child a sum of not less than two or more than ten shillings per week until it is fourteen years of age, towards defraying the cost of its maintenance.

The Act does not specify that children may be licensed to their parents if these are worthy of the trust, but the Commissioners' Report contained a recommendation to this effect (thereby reproducing one of the most important features of the Massachusetts Plan), and we believe the State Council is free to include such parents among the persons with whom they are authorised to place children, and practically does so.

It will be seen how wide and elastic are the powers conferred upon the Council, and how completely the State children, as in Massachusetts, are by this Act dissociated from adult pauperism and crime.

The Amending Destitute Persons Act received the assent of the Governor of South Australia on Nov. 17th, 1886, and the State Council was appointed without delay. The Commissioners, acknowledging the valuable services of the Boarding-out Society, recommended in their Report

that some of its members should be invited to join the Council; and Miss Clark and others who had worked upon the Committee were included among the seven ladies and five gentlemen selected by the Governor to form it. He chose one of these twelve, Dr. E. C. Stirling, to be its President.

It held its first meeting a few days later, and on the 1st of January 1887 assumed control of the Industrial and Reformatory Schools and their inmates, and of the children placed out.[1] To enlarge and perfect supervision over them (in addition to that of the paid inspector), the visiting ladies, hitherto acting individually, were invited by the Council to obtain recruits and to form themselves into local Committees. So cordially did they respond that by June 30th (the close of the next official year), 1888, forty-two Committees were in operation. At the same date the number of children under the care of the Council was 800. Of these, 25 were at the Magill Receiving Depôt awaiting distribution, 49 boys on the *Fitz-James* Hulk Reformatory, 20 girls in the Magill Reformatory; 687 were placed out, whether on subsidy, adoption, licence, or apprenticeship; 9 were in hospitals or asylums (but, not having attained the age of 18, still under State control), and 10 had absconded and were still at large. The latter class seems to be habitually larger in the colonies than with us, the sparse population probably making escape more easy, and recovery more difficult. Only six State children had died during the year, three being infants, and the rest young children. There had been a marked diminution of criminal children committed, and it is suggested that this may be partly due to the effect of the wise methods on which a large proportion of the State children have been cared for during the past sixteen years, thus preventing the growth of a permanent criminal class. Such a class, the Hon. Chief Justice Way stated, when recently addressing a jury on circuit, does not exist in South Australia.[2]

The total expenditure for the year upon State children

[1] *1st Report of the Children's State Council.* Adelaide, 1887.
[2] *2d Report of the Children's State Council,* 1888.

amounted to £10,393. The weekly cost per head of the temporary children at Magill is 13s. 2d., and of the reformatory girls 16s. 5¾d., while that of the boys on the *Fitz-James* Hulk Reformatory is 12s. 7¾d. There are probably several young people out on adoption, and licensed for service, for whom payment is not made, but very few children are now begun to be boarded-out without the 5s. subsidy (with, we conclude, a suitable allowance for clothes, etc.), increased according to circumstances for infants, and for those who, being physically diseased or morally depraved, require special treatment. For children of the latter classes small Probationary Homes are contemplated. Three other important proposals were set forth in the Council's first Report, and are again strongly urged on Government for its acceptance—(1) That a receiving depôt for the temporary children be opened in or near Adelaide. (2) That separate accommodation be provided for the reformatory girls, and that, Magill being thus vacated, the reformatory boys be transferred thither from the *Fitz-James*, which is, for many reasons, unfit for its present use. (3) Negotiations have been opened for placing the Roman Catholic reformatory girls (hitherto in the same school with the Protestants) under the charge of a Sisterhood; and the Council propose to erect Cottage Homes for the Protestants. By locating ten only in each Cottage it is hoped that some of the benefits of family life may be secured, and the existing evil be put an end to of associating comparatively young girls with those committed sometimes when past the age of 17, and from the worst haunts of Adelaide.[1]

The placed-out children had, at the date of the Report, upwards of £2000 in the Savings Bank. Great pains are taken by Mr. Whiting, the Secretary to the Council, to stimulate saving habits and to protect the children from the temptation on 'discharge' to squander the lump sum which then comes into their hands, as also from the demands of rapacious relatives. Some equitable method of securing its wise expenditure, perhaps even of converting it into assur-

[1] *Report*, 1888.

ance against sickness and old age, is engaging, we believe, the attention of the Council.

The returns (to Magill) during the year were 127, largely from the child not suiting the home first chosen, who doubtless were soon placed out again; and the transfers were 115. These numbers far exceed any known here, and are partly, it may be supposed, due to the interference of parents, a risk inseparable from the plan as applied to others than genuine orphans, and which must be duly considered in its extension to other classes.

The rapid extension in 1872 of the method of placing out children in South Australia attracted the attention of neighbouring colonies. In Victoria boarding-out was begun in that year by the late Mr. George O. Duncan, Secretary to the Industrial and Reformatory Schools Department, and with the able assistance of Mr. Neal, now also dead, was greatly extended in 1876; the present Secretary to the Department is Mr. George Guillaume, appointed in 1881, whose ability and strong interest in the work are conspicuous in his yearly Reports. So thoroughly convinced are its promoters of its superiority to the big School system that all the State Industrial Schools (answering not only to Industrial Schools under the Home Office here, but to our pauper schools also) have been gradually cleared of permanent occupants, two being retained as receiving and distributing depôts. Thus the government Institution for Infants at Melbourne was closed in 1873, and that at Geelong for 300 boys in 1876. It was afterwards used for girls for a short time, but was finally closed in 1878. Meanwhile in 1875 an Industrial School at St. Kilda's Road, containing over 300 children, one at Ballarat for 200 children, and the ship *Nelson*, an Industrial School for from two to three hundred boys, had all been closed. The Industrial School at Sunbury, which in 1872 contained 643 children, was finally closed in 1877, the whole of the children being by that time boarded-out. The Royal Park Schools, erected at an expense of some £40,000, were occupied from 1877 to 1879 by about 300 boys and girls. They were then

closed, and the buildings have since been handed over to the Immigrants' Aid Society, who at present occupy them.[1] There are voluntary institutions still in operation, but the number of children within their walls is greatly diminished, and we believe they also will eventually be closed. It will be seen that the Government of Victoria did not hesitate to sacrifice a new and costly building as soon as they felt it would be for the children's good to do so, but they are assured that ultimately the step will prove a considerable State economy.

The only State institutions for destitute children now existing in Melbourne are the two receiving depôts—one for boys between six and fifteen, which is also an Immigrant Depôt, and where, by placing the children under the charge of the Superintendent of the immigrants, special staff expenses are saved; the other for girls and infants of both sexes, brought in sometimes when only a day old. A few small Probationary Schools for not more than eighteen children each, have been opened in the country under Acts passed in December 1887 to amend the laws relating to juvenile offenders and neglected children. They are home-like in character, and are intended to be feeders of Boarding-out. The term of committal to them is six months, with power of extension to a year if necessary, and they are designed for children who, though presumably innocent, have been taken from the lowest haunts, and for others who from various causes need a short, sharp discipline before they can be placed in a foster-home.

The Acts to which we refer pretty closely correspond with the Destitute Persons Amending Act, 1886, of South Australia in scope and provisions, but with a very serious exception, to be hereafter, as we understand, remedied. They contain no powers for creating an honorary Board similar to those of Massachusetts and South Australia. Neglected children (under which term are also included the parentless and destitute) are committed to the charge of the secretary of the Reformatory and Industrial Schools

[1] *Report of the Destitute Act Commission, South Australia*, 1885; before which Mr. G. Guillaume, Secretary to the Industrial and Reformatory Schools Department, Victoria, gave much valuable evidence.

Department, or to that of some duly appointed person or institution, until the age of eighteen, and these have authority to dispose of them by putting them in schools or placing them in foster-homes, with power of transfer from one to the other as circumstances may suggest; the criminal child may be sent by the Judges direct to a Reformatory or Industrial School, when the Superintendent or Matron becomes its legal guardian; but the secretary to the Department acts jointly with them in any subsequent change in its treatment. It is committed until the age of 18, with power to the Governor in Council to extend the age to 21.

Parents are invested with power to transfer from themselves the Guardianship of children to other persons or institutions; and if a child has been received, without objection on the part of its father, into an asylum and maintained there for two years, he cannot remove it without the consent of the Managers, or of the Governor in Council (and it remains under the Guardianship of such Managers until it reaches the age of eighteen), unless the father can prove he has not been guilty of negligence. Such an enactment in regard to pauper children at home would be a boon to them indeed.

While boys are at the Depôt, inquiries are made about their parents, upon whom a maintenance order is always served if practicable. The lads, however, are kept as short a time as possible at the Depôt, remaining, according to circumstances, from a day to a fortnight, before being sent to the destination chosen for them. Boys who have proved unmanageable in a foster-home may be returned to the Depôt while another home is found; and service boys, *i.e.* boys eligible for service, but whose foster-parents have not been successful in finding them places, are also received there; but returns to the Depôt are discouraged.

The girls' Depôt is under the care of a Matron and four attendants; one of these has to travel with the younger boys and the girls to their foster-homes; another is sewing mistress, and makes the children's clothes and outfits. For the babies the Matron has a list of foster-mothers, who

are also wet nurses, with whom they are placed out immediately, not being kept longer than a few hours if possible. Foster-mothers, who are also wet nurses, are paid at the rate of twelve shillings a week for the first year.

Children committed in localities remote from Melbourne are sent to the Depôt to be disposed of from it, as they are very rarely placed in the district to which they belong. Should the officer in charge of the Depôt observe that a child has contracted depraved habits, unfitting it for a foster-home, he reports the fact to the proper authority, and the child is transferred instead to a Reformatory or to a Probationary Home. The daily number in each Depôt ranges from fifteen to thirty.

The scheme for providing for all the criminal, destitute, and neglected children in Victoria necessarily assumes large proportions, and may be summed up under the following heads:—(1) Committal to a Reformatory or Industrial School; (2) Boarding-out, including wet-nursing; (3) Adoption; (4) Licensing for service, either with or without educational conditions; (5) Apprenticeship; (6) Transfer to an Industrial or Reformatory School; (7) Discharge by the Governor in Council (without power to recall) to respectable friends or relatives; (8) Placing with respectable relations or friends provisionally, under either boarding-out or licensing regulations, in either case without payment and with power of recall.

It will be seen that many features of the Massachusetts Plan are embodied in the new Victorian laws. The organisation for administering them consists of the Central State office in Melbourne, and voluntary local Committees—chiefly of ladies, and constituted almost identically with our Certified Committees, scattered throughout the Colony; the earliest formed (under Mr. Duncan's Secretaryship) date from 1873. In 1888 they numbered 110. The Committees send to the secretary of the Reformatory and Industrial Schools Department lists of foster-parents duly recommended, receive and pay out the Government maintenance money, inspect the children in their homes at least every six weeks, and report upon their condition. Should

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

they have reason to believe that a child is not rightly treated, they have the power to transfer it immediately to another home. They report the fact to the Melbourne office, but have not to wait for authority. The Committees are selected locally, the appointment of their members being ratified and recorded at the Central office; and they generally include one or more members of each principal church.

The lists of approved foster-homes, both Protestant and Catholic, are kept at the Melbourne office, the names of the children to be boarded-out are registered there in corresponding lists, and the Melbourne officers make suitable choice from one for the other. There are two visiting officers, who go round annually to each home, accompanied by the local lady correspondent (*i.e.* secretary of the committee) and another member of the Committee. The visiting officer never visits alone, except in some country districts, where he may be obliged to do so on account of the distance being so great that the members may be unable to accompany him from home to home.

The children are boarded-out to thirteen years of age, at a rate of 5s. a week after the first year, and an outfit, which the foster-mother is expected to renew and keep up to the mark without special allowance. The Government secretary at Melbourne has a discretionary power to pay 8s. a week for children of delicate constitutions, or uncleanly or objectionable habits. Ministerial authority can also be given for a still higher rate of payment when thought necessary, as in the case of some imbecile children, for whom as much as 12s. a week has occasionally been paid.

As at home, Catholic children are placed exclusively with Catholics, and Protestants with Protestants, and all are required to attend school regularly, except that the local Committees have power to allow prescribed exceptions in the case of girls who stand high at school; while for those over twelve they have limited power to exempt on certain days.[1] As far as possible, brothers and sisters are

[1] The compulsory school age in Victoria is now fifteen; but it is proposed to lower it to thirteen, a change ardently desired apparently by the local Committees, as they find girls (and, we conclude, boys also) impatient to be off and doing for themselves at fourteen.

kept together, and as many are placed in the same house as there is fit sleeping accommodation for; but practically six seems to be the limit.

The Department provides medical attendance, paying the local medical officer £1 per annum for each single boarded-out child, £1 : 10s. where there are two in one house, and £2 where there are three or more. He must see them once a month, either at their homes or at some other place appointed by him. In the country the children are chiefly placed with small farmers and farm-labourers, and in the towns with labourers and mechanics, but boarding-out in the comparatively dense parts of Melbourne and the suburbs is now given up.

The cases of adoption are of foundling children or those deprived of parents, though not always by death; and the Committees usually maintain a limited supervision, unless the adopter belongs to the upper classes, when supervision ceases. But if the child has disreputable relations, it is not 'discharged' (*i.e.* released from State control), whatever be the position of the person adopting it, in order that Government protection may, if needed, avail against its bad connections—Government protection in Victoria being, as we have seen, extended till the age of eighteen.

Adoption is said to be very successful, but it is not deemed desirable to permit it to begin when children are past six years old, as it is believed they do not attach themselves strongly after that age. As evidence, however, of the warmth of affection which springs up before it, we may note that many outside applications to adopt children already boarded-out have to be refused, because the moment it is proposed to transfer the child the foster-parents assert a prior right to adopt it themselves. Sometimes it is felt by the Department that undue pressure has thus been put upon the foster-parents, and while consenting to adoption by them, it continues the pay for a year longer.

Licensing for service, *i.e.* placing the children at service under State control and inspection, is employed for those whose term of boarding-out is fulfilled, and for such as may come under the care of the Department when already

too old to be placed with foster-parents. Both boys and girls are available for licence; the boys go chiefly to farmers, to keep them away from the temptations of large towns, but they are also licensed to many different trades, according to capability. The girls seem all to be licensed for ordinary domestic service. The term is not fixed, as experience shows that in Australia, as elsewhere, many girls, on going out, even from a foster-home, do not realise at once what service demands, and often lose their first place; but when this happens with a licensed girl, by the help of the local Committees, a second is almost invariably found for her, to which she can go at once, without a return to the Depôt.

The licensed children are furnished with a good outfit when placed out, and receive generally 5s. a week in wages, increasing a shilling a week for every year of service. Out of this they must renew their clothes, and their employer has to remit one shilling a week quarterly, during the first year, two the second, three the third, etc., out of their wages to the Department, which places these sums to the children's credit at the Post Office Savings Bank. The lump sum is usually paid to the children, as in South Australia, when their term of service expires, or at the age of eighteen, when they pass from under State control, except that in certain cases a provisional power can be given to withhold the money till the child is twenty-one. The Department, under Ministerial sanction, may also recoup itself for expenses incurred on the child's account through its misconduct, fines, or wilful damage to employer's property.[1] Of course the mere possession of even self-earned money cannot transform a heedless child into a thrifty and prudent saver, and there are cases where their little hoards are foolishly squandered; others when evil relations get hold of them. Still it seems to be believed that the balance of advantage is to the children in possessing a sum of their own, however small, to start with, and in the impetus to work and save which so tangible a result is likely to produce.

[1] Juvenile Offenders Law Amendment Act, 1887, Victoria, § 52.

Beyond the attendance at Sunday school and church of licensed children, no educational regulations are imposed upon the employer, unless, from various causes, they have to make the school attendances required by the Education Act. If this happens, the employer, as a rule, gives no wages beyond pocket money and clothes.

The licensed children who have been brought up under the Boarding-out system are the test of its success or failure. On this point Mr. Guillaume is conclusive in his testimony. To the question, 'Has it [*i.e.* Boarding-out] prevented immorality to any great extent among the girls?' he answered (having previously stated 'there are many girls on the streets the product of the old barrack system, but scarcely any who have been reared in foster-homes,')[1] 'I am sure it has. . . . I think the difference [as compared with the large institution] can be fairly attributed to the protection the service girl is surrounded with in her foster-district. The public opinion that has formed round her there, the influence over her for good acquired by her foster-parents and their friends, her teacher both in day and Sunday school, her clergyman and the lady visitors, must do much to prevent the girl from going astray, placing her in a position very different to that of a girl launched out into service from an institution, perhaps at a vast distance away from it, and among perfect strangers. I think it right to mention that the same remark applies to the boys as to the girls as to going astray, for this reason,—many of the old institution boys have no one to fall back upon, and they do fall into some immoral practices; whereas those who are brought up and licensed out in foster-districts escape the contamination that a friendless boy would meet with. When a boy goes to service we send a notification of his having gone to the correspondent [*i.e.* secretary of the Boarding-out Committee] and the clergyman [of the district in which he is placed]; we send him each month by post, during his first year of service, a number of the *Boys' Own Paper* at the cost of the Department. He usually subscribes for it himself subsequently. The

[1] *Report of the Destitute Act Commission* (*South Australia*).

service girls also receive a magazine, *The Girls' Own Paper*.'[1]

Apprenticeship of the children of the State in Victoria applies almost exclusively to the boys, and begins generally at fifteen, for three or five years. The plan is preferred to licensing for service when a boy shows special talent for, and strong desire to enter, a particular trade. It is not used in the case of farm boys, partly because a lad is not made sufficiently master of the farming business to warrant his being under indenture for a series of years, partly because it is possible some of the small farmers might take advantage of a boy thus bound. The Department makes all arrangements for clothes, board, and wages.

The treatment, under the 6th provision, of vicious and depraved children needs little comment. They are transferred from the Depôt to a Reformatory School; the number does not seem to be large; and boys under fifteen are told, on entering, that they can shorten their term of detention to one year by persistent good conduct.

In the case of friends applying for children under the 7th and 8th provisions, careful inquiry is made, and all possible information obtained as to the character and circumstances of the applicant. Should the result be satisfactory, and only if satisfactory, the child is absolutely discharged; but if earning his own living, his written consent is necessary. The successful applicant repays to the State the value of the clothing he receives with the child; except that when, as occasionally happens, several children (the members of one family, we suppose) are discharged at once to a relative in poor circumstances, he is allowed to buy the boarding-out kit at a nominal price. The cost of transferring the child to the applicant's home must be defrayed by him; and if the Department has a claim against him for maintenance, its settlement is demanded, and, so far as may be found reasonable and possible, obtained before the child is given up. When the debtor's address has been unknown for years, these arrears may have largely accumulated, and frequently a commuted sum far below

[1] *Report of the Destitute Act Commission.*

the amount accrued is accepted. In this way a lump sum is recovered even when there may have been no magisterial order recorded.[1]

If, in answer to the inquiries made, it is found that the applicant's character or circumstances would lead to the child's moral injury, his request is refused — a wise and merciful exercise of power, for which we trust the authority may hereafter be embodied in English law. 'Drunkenness would be one reason [for refusing absolute discharge]. Where there is a strong parental affection, however, this obstacle is often overcome, the applicant consenting to take the pledge on the promise of the Department that if faithfully kept for a term, say of six months, the child, or children, will be provisionally intrusted to him. Another ground is open immorality. This is counted an absolute bar to compliance, even as regards boys. A third ground is the residence of the applicant in a low locality. A complete removal from such surroundings is in almost all cases insisted on, and very frequently effected.'[2] Provisional discharge (under the 8th provision) differs from absolute discharge in so far as the children are still subject to supervision by the visiting officer, and, where possible, by the local Committee. In some cases the children over boarding-out age are licensed to the relatives; those below are boarded-out with them; but whether licensed or boarded-out, no money is paid either as subsidy or wage. The large majority of applications are granted provisionally, the power of recall being retained whenever the Department is not fully satisfied as to the applicant's ability, unaided by departmental supervision, to control the child, or as to the applicant's assured recovery from habits of intemperance.[3]

These regulations show that in Australia parents' rights are not severed from their duties. A due balance is preserved between them, and the man who makes no effort to provide for his children cannot complain if he is not allowed to do as he will with his own when strangers have been

[1] *Report of the Destitute Act Commission*, Mr. Guillaume's evidence.
[2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*

doing his work for him, and acquired moral, if not parental, rights over his abandoned or neglected offspring.

'The steady progress of the boarding-out system is, I think,' says Mr. Guillaume, 'the most gratifying feature in the transactions recorded. Happy results are being increasingly realised. As the system becomes more generally known a larger choice offers of Christian homes with foster-parents of a high character, and it becomes increasingly apparent that this is a thoroughly satisfactory mode—indeed the only satisfactory one—of dealing with the great majority of the "Children of the State," whose misfortune it has been to be deprived at the outset of their career of the advantages and happiness of true family life.'[1]

The economic results are very satisfactory, not only as regards actual expenditure, but also in the diminished number of children thrown on the State. When Boarding-out began in Victoria in 1872 there were 2384 children in the hands of the Department committed as 'neglected' (as distinguished from 'criminal'), and costing the State £46,669. By 1886 the total number of children was 1999, and their cost £37,279, and this during a period when population was increasing much more rapidly than in England.[2] The figures for 1887 are higher than for the preceding year, attributed in the Report to increase in committals from the city and its poorer suburbs; the average age of the 542 children ('criminal' are included here) received during the year is considerably below that of the year before.[3] These two facts seem to show that the Victorians are alive to the importance of placing children of 'the perishing and dangerous classes' under reformatory conditions as early as possible, instead of leaving them to be initiated into vice and crime before their reclamation is begun.

In estimating the economy in money effected since 1872, account must be taken of the sum saved by setting

[1] *Report of the Industrial and Reformatory Schools Department, Victoria*, 1882.

[2] *Melbourne Daily Telegraph*, November 15th, 1886.

[3] *Report of the Department for Neglected Children and Reformatory Schools*, 1888.

free the large and costly buildings previously occupied by the children.[1]

With reference to the maintenance collections also, Victoria beats the record, showing an average per head of £3 : 8 : 5, as against £1 : 3 : 11¼ for Reformatory and Industrial Schools for children in England.[2]

The system of Boarding-out children instead of placing them in institutions was strongly advocated in the second Report, dated 1874, of the Royal Commission on *The Public Charities of New South Wales*, drawn up by its Chairman, Mr., now the Hon. Justice, Windeyer. The same evils were shown to exist in the public asylums there which have produced such deplorable results in the Mother country. The classification was hopelessly defective; little creatures whose only crime was their poverty were placed with girls whose lives had been the vilest. In one instance, in a school of an expensive character (the annual cost per head being given as £37 : 4 : 4), the most shameful outbreaks occurred, attributable probably, in part, to the ill-temper and want of judgment of the master and matron, but also in great measure the result of monotonous and unhealthy conditions. Many of the institutions were so greatly overcrowded as to be dangerously insanitary; industrial training was very defective, and in one institution, Randwick Asylum (partly supported by private generosity, partly by large public grants), great abuses of patronage had crept in, inducing a pauper spirit among parents who availed themselves of the charity, while perfectly able to support their children.[3]

Among the remedies urgently recommended by the Commission was the application in all practicable cases of

[1] The Government of Victoria is now extending the benefits of individual and home-like surroundings to other dependents besides its children. The *Times* of July 27th, 1888, under the head of 'Budget of Victoria' states, 'The Government intends to sell the site of the Lunatic Asylum near Melbourne, and place the patients in Cottage Hospitals in country districts; it is expected that £1,000,000 will thus be realised.'

[2] *Reports of the Industrial and Reformatory Schools Department, Victoria*, 1887 and 1888. The amount in Victoria continues to increase.

[3] *Report on the Public Charities of New South Wales.* Sydney, 1874.

Boarding-out, detailed information being given of its working and results in Great Britain and Ireland as well as in the neighbouring colonies. But adverse interests were strong, and the recommendation was not fully acted on till 1882, when the control of all destitute and criminal children was transferred to a specially created department called the 'State Children's Relief Board,' the members of which are appointed by Government, are honorary, and include ladies as well as gentlemen.

But in the interval between the issuing of the Report containing these recommendations and their official adoption, Mrs. Windeyer and a few other ladies and gentlemen, all earnest believers in Boarding-out, formed themselves into a little society and obtained permission to begin operations in 1879, placing out fifty-seven children within the year, and receiving Government grants to defray their cost. Four of the children were quickly reclaimed by relatives; one, a weakly little foundling, died within the year; but another, an infant frail from its birth, became comparatively strong. Lady visitors were appointed in every district where a child was placed, whose zealous aid, together with the uniform kindliness of the foster-parents, thoroughly satisfied the Committee with their experiment.[1] Some of its members formed the nucleus of the State Children's Board; the first Government department, we believe, under British rule in which women have been included, for though the history of the State Children's Council of South Australia is identical, and it was planned first, it came into actual existence a year or two later. A rapid development of the system on the lines laid down in Victoria followed the formation of the New South Wales Board under the presidency of the Hon. Arthur Renwick, M.D. Its Annual Reports are of great interest, and recall English experience on many points. We find ourselves face to face with the old difficulty of dissolute parents neglecting their children when they choose, and claiming them when they are likely to be profitable. There is the same disposition on the part of relatives to withdraw

[1] *First Annual Report of the Society for Boarding-out Destitute Children.* Sydney, 1880.

children from State control rather than have them boarded-out, there is the same improvement, moral and physical, in the children, when under more natural conditions. There is the same financial gain, New South Wales saving at least 25 per cent in this department of her expenditure, 'apart from all other advantages in connection with the maintenance and training of our dependent children.'[1] There is, too, the crucial test, a diminishing number of State children, noted under the Boarding-out scheme by Mr. Skelton in Scotland, by the authorities in Massachusetts, and by Mr. Guillaume in Victoria. The total number of State children prior to the Boarding-out system in 1880 was 1485, the total number properly chargeable according to latest returns in 1886 was 1163, reduction 322.[2] 'From whichever point of view,' continues the Report, 'the figures may be regarded, the operation of the Boarding-out system must be deemed highly satisfactory; as, considering the increase in the population of the Colony since 1879, we might reasonably have expected the same proportionate increase in the number of dependent children, as the most recent official reports show there has been in regard to adult paupers, criminals, and lunatics, and as there was also in the number of children in the four years prior to the system of Boarding-out.' In the next paragraph Dr. Renwick gives the annual saving by Boarding-out at £6260 : 6 : 1 as compared with 1880.[3] To correctly estimate the significance of these figures it must be remembered that population is increasing rapidly in New South Wales, and that the years just mentioned were those of great commercial depression.

The mortality from disease (there was one accidental death) amounted to less than 1.5 per thousand![4] Yet, from the first, delicate and very young children have been boarded-out. In the first Annual Report of the State Children's Relief Department we read, 'Infants at the breast (who may require foster-parents) and crippled children are always boarded-out when homes can be found for them. The Board indeed carefully considered whether such cases

[1] *State Children's Relief Board Report*, 1885, New South Wales.
[2] *Report*, 1886. [3] *Ibid.* [4] *Report*, 1887.

should be brought within the scope of their operations, but several delicate children who were removed from the Benevolent Asylum [which at that time corresponded, broadly speaking, to an English workhouse], and placed with families in the district of Goulburn, have developed into such strong and healthy children that it was determined to incur the risk of an increased mortality [among those boarded out] rather than deprive sickly infants of the advantages which could only be conferred upon them by the Boarding-out System.'[1]

Higher subsidies are given for delicate and otherwise difficult children, the rates being 7s., 6s., and 5s. per week, but the class paid for at the higher rates seems steadily to diminish. How widely the system may be applied is shown by an enumeration of cases thus described—consumptive, of dirty habits, unmanageable and immoral, scrofulous and weak eyes, eruptive complaint, discharging ears, weak intellect, etc. etc.[2]

As in Victoria, the family system has not been accepted half-heartedly, the children have not been left in public institutions *because* they were already built, and it was a pity not to use them. In the colonies, evidently, the children are held to be worth more than the big buildings.

In New South Wales inspection is partly by Government officials, partly by local visiting ladies. Applications for foster-children must be signed by a magistrate, or have a clergyman's recommendation, but experience, unhappily, shows these must not be accepted until after rigorous inquiry by the Department. Dr. Renwick describes remarkable specimens of homes rejected after this precautionary proceeding, the recommendation having been evidently signed on the slightest inquiry, in one flagrant instance in favour of a man of notoriously bad character, after a solitary attendance at church.

Naturally country homes are chosen, and there is a supply of good ones. Very few of the children have been moved on account of unsatisfactory behaviour of the Guardians, as the foster-parents are called; but several on

[1] *First Annual Report.* [2] *Sixth Annual Report.*

account of the interference of relations. The boys do especially well on large dairy farms, where they find congenial occupation and every advantage for health, and entire severance from city life.

Here, as elsewhere, there is a sad residuum of children unfit for boarding-out on account of physical infirmities or moral depravity. It has been a difficult problem how best to deal with these; to condemn them to continued residence in sick wards is too often to destroy any chance they may have of ultimate recovery, and to add gloom to existence already heavily burdened. We have seen how courageously boarding-out is employed where possible, but there are some who cannot safely be placed in families where there are other young children. The problem, however, has been solved by kindly thought and effort. Small Homes, as nearly as possible like natural ones, have been established in healthy situations, each under the charge of a motherly Matron. There they have every comfort and chance of recovery, and special care is taken to prevent moral or physical mischief. But it is not intended that even these children should remain permanently in the Homes. When fresh air and good food and nursing have done their work, and the bad symptoms disappear or are sufficiently modified, they are boarded-out, and complete recovery comes in time. It is significant these invalids were chiefly not from miserable homes, but from institutions, and that a large proportion were cases of ophthalmia and skin disease.[1]

With reference to those still more pitiable little ones whose life has been poisoned at its very source by the demoralising atmosphere of their surroundings, polluting even the youngest with a revolting knowledge of vice, it is found absolutely essential to isolate them from innocent children and place them in small reformatory Homes or under medical treatment. A shocking instance is given of the mischief done by one of these wretched children when placed among others in the Industrial school, either from ignorance of her previous life or from that

[1] *Report*, 1887.

deplorable want of classification of which we have so often spoken.

A feature of the colonial reports are the letters of the children and of the foster-parents. The children give unanimous testimony to their preference for the home over institution life, and their letters tell of school days, treats, and domestic events, and record many promises to try and be good, promises which appear to be kept, as the foster-parents' letters constantly speak of their improvement. The foster-parents' complaints of the dirty habits, untruthfulness, and stupidity of the children, when first received, are like echoes from far-away England; but so, too, are their reports of constant improvement as the children grow happier and brighter, and it is quite evident that colonial foster-parents become as interested in, and as proud of, their share in the good work as their prototypes at home.

Queensland was later than her sister colonies in adopting Boarding-out, but it is reported on by the Department of Public Instruction as being in satisfactory operation with 93 children in 1884, though still in a tentative stage. The maximum number of children in one cottage was six, but this proved to be too many, and was afterwards reduced to four. The inspection, originally purely official, was subsequently found insufficient, and the help of Ladies' Committees has been obtained. By the beginning of 1886 the numbers had increased to 131, and on the 31st December of that year to 218, being rather under a fifth of the total number of State children, upon the whole of whom, however, the increase was, for that year, only 24. During the latter part of 1887 the admissions had been steadily decreasing, proving 'that the poorer classes of the community, from whom these children are mostly recruited, are in better circumstances now than they were eighteen months ago, and that the prevalent depression of that period has passed away.'[1] Probably, too, the influence of Boarding-out to diminish the numbers cast upon the State had its effect here as elsewhere.

[1] *Report of the Inspector of Orphanages for the year* 1887. Brisbane.

The children are, as in other Colonies, admitted in the first instance into institutions (here called orphanages) scattered over the Colony, some under State care, and some under voluntary management subsidised by the State, and thence drafted into foster-homes; but there is not the same rapid and general clearance effected as where boarding-out has become the national method of dealing with them. The objection, however, on the part of the managers of the institutions to parting with them is evidently diminishing, greatly to the advantage of the children's health and happiness, especially as country homes are superseding those in towns. Unhappily boarding-out is prohibited under the age of one year, and in the State Infants' Home appropriated to babies the mortality for 1887 was 33.3 per cent, although many were nursed there by their own mothers.[1] The Inspector (Mr. Horrocks) recommends the boarding-out of sickly or deformed children now retained in the Orphanages, and mentions two instances in which the experiment was tried as a last resource, with the best results.

In addition to the children boarded-out there are 'adopted' and 'hired-out' children, besides a few 'apprenticed,' under State supervision, but the number of the former is extremely limited, owing to the few orphans available, and the fear of interference from parents. This reason also deters desirable foster-parents from applying; and legal power to retain control over the children, similar to that granted in other Colonies, is advocated by Mr. Horrocks, to secure the permanent benefit of the children placed out, but also to prevent parents from lightly casting their offspring upon the State. 'There are many parents,' he says, 'in temporary difficulties, who look upon the Orphanage as a public boarding-school, and do not scruple to make use of it, whereas they should put their shoulders to the wheel and make an effort to extricate themselves. This is proved as soon as the children are boarded-out, when the parents in question peremptorily demand the discharge of their children, thus showing that they are able

[1] *Report of the Inspector of Orphanages for the year* 1887. Brisbane.

to maintain them. I am confident that if boarding-out were adopted altogether, these people would not apply to put their children under the charge of the State, and a good many hundred pounds would be saved to the country in consequence. It is exceedingly difficult to detect this class of applicants when they apply for their children's admission, as many of them are really in difficulties of a temporary nature at that time: when their circumstances change for the better, they are not honest enough to say so, and continue to keep their children either wholly or in part at the public expense. It is only when the test of boarding-out is applied that it becomes apparent that their case is not so desperate as represented. At the Orphanage the parents can see their children every Thursday, but when boarded-out they may have to travel some distance by rail or road, to which they have a great objection.'[1]

The following narrative of the death of one of the 'hired-out' boys, is very touching. The lad, John P. Waldon—his name deserves remembrance—was drowned during a flood. 'He had been cautioned not to attempt to swim the creek, but a neighbour was in want of some flour. The boy, who was close on 16 years of age, saddled his horse and swam the creek with the flour; he got back all right, but in attempting the same feat again he and his horse were swept away by the flood, and the poor lad was drowned. It is supposed that the girths broke, as his feet were still in the stirrups when the body was found. His master, who had been absent for the day, was greatly grieved, and says in his letter to the Department—"We had a great affection for the poor boy, he was so good and quiet, and if he had lived would have made a good Colonist; he was the same as one of my own children to me. He was so manly, truthful, and industrious; I never heard him make use of a bad word since he came to me."'[2]

The boys do much better 'hired-out' than the girls, of whom no less than 40 out of 100, apparently brought up in the Orphanages, were returned during the year, mainly from their own fault. 'One reason of this is,' in the

[1] *Report of the Inspector of Orphanages.* Brisbane, 1888. [2] *Ibid.*

Inspector's opinion, 'that boys up to sixteen years old [the present limit of legal control] generally remain boys in their habits and behaviour, but with the girls in this country it is otherwise; many of them are young women at fifteen years of age, impatient of control, fond of idling, and display a decided distaste for honest work. . . . The theory is that the parentage of many of these children is very low, and that the bad qualities of either or both parents come out in the children . . . but the want of a proper system is really at the bottom of the mischief.'[1]

The remedies suggested by the Inspector are to raise the age of control to 18, and to draft the girls both from Orphanages and foster-homes on reaching their twelfth year into small Training Homes where family life should be combined with discipline and instruction in all kinds of domestic work, and where ladies seeking servants and the girls needing places might meet face to face and have a better chance of mutually suiting than when the choice rests, as now, with the officers of the institutions. It cannot be doubted that the system of Boarding-out is severely strained when applied to children whose own parents may turn up and claim, or at any rate interfere with, them any day, and though hoping that the Inspector's suggestions, if carried into effect, may do much to remove the serious evils he has pointed out, we trust that other means may, if possible, be also sought in an extension of the period of boarding-out, and the cultivation of a more permanent tie between foster-parent and child.

In dealing with her 'perishing and dangerous classes,' the colony of Tasmania has had to struggle against a hereditary burden which South Australia and New Zealand never knew, and which has been lightened to New South Wales and the bordering colonies by their vast extent. She long ago shook off her early name, Van Dieman's Land, as tainted with convict associations, and she availed herself early of Boarding-out, to purify the miserable offspring of her prison population. She gave a gratifying recognition of the purport of this book when, soon after its appearance,

[1] *Report*, 1888.

LIB... OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFO

she reprinted, as a parliamentary paper, all of its contents bearing on the system she desired to adopt, and by 1873 she had put the plan in operation. In 1875 there were 40 children boarded out; the number on the 31st December 1887 was 109, being an increase of 10 on the preceding year. This was caused by an amended Education Act requiring school attendance until 13; thus the children have now to be retained in their foster-homes until that age, instead of being put out to work at 12 as formerly. It had been feared, as elsewhere, but with some show of reason in an ex-penal colony, that a sufficient number of respectable foster-parents could not be found; but in Tasmania also, as elsewhere, wholly without foundation. Boarding-out is fully established as the recognised method of dealing with the State children, and the Annual Reports of the Government Department responsible for the welfare of the children—that, namely, administering 'Charitable Grants'—show the continued success of the scheme.

These Reports do not contain the varying details or philosophic exposition of general principles which endow with a literary interest those from the larger Colonies; but they are business-like, and give an account of each child when needful, showing that full particulars are periodically ascertained and recorded. They are signed by the members of the Department, and to the Report for 1887 is appended a memorandum by the Premier testifying to his interest in the work performed by the Board, and his appreciation of its importance. A pleasant proof of outside sympathy is thus recorded: 'The Committee have to acknowledge the receipt, for three years past, through the agency of the *Mercury* Office, of a donation of £3 per annum to the boarded-out children. The donor is unknown to the Committee, but they beg to tender their best thanks for the kind gift. The amount on each occasion was equally divided and paid into the children's own hands by the Inspecting Officer, as a Christmas present from a friend interested in their welfare.'[1] Some few cases of neglect, and suspicion even of harsh usage, are mentioned,

[1] *Report* for 1886.

but they are also reported as promptly remedied. The Tasmanian foster-parents would appear to have been long fully up to the average, as the Report for 1881 concludes thus: 'The Committee has no hesitation in expressing their belief that the Boarding-out system, which has now been in operation eight or nine years, is working most satisfactorily, and they feel convinced that no one who has watched its progress and noted the results obtained, can do aught but admit that the success predicted for it has been most abundantly realised. Abuses have existed, as has been shown in this Report; but it could hardly be expected that so large a number of children could be provided for without the occurrence of occasional infringements of the regulations framed for their protection, more especially when it is borne in mind that the machinery provided for supervision and inspection, indispensable elements to the success of the movement, was until lately decidedly inadequate.'

Inspection, when the system was first adopted, was entirely official, made partly by surprise visits, and seemed to be satisfactory. More constant supervision was, however, after a time felt to be necessary, and regulations were framed enabling ladies and gentlemen to form themselves into committees for the recommending of homes, visiting and supervising the children, and finding them places when old enough. We may here note that Tasmania has had her unsatisfactory experience of boarding-out children with relatives, coinciding with that of other countries.

The rate of payment was originally fixed at 5s. a week, but this was found inadequate, and it has been raised to 6s. Nevertheless we find the annual expenditure per head for 1887 given as £12 : 15 : 6; probably repayments by parents supply the balance.[1]

In the Reports from each of the Colonies we find points of special importance made prominent, and experience

[1] *Boarding-out Destitute Children, Report for* 1887. Charitable Grants Department, 16th April 1888. Hobart.

children are thus entrusted, knowing this, are put upon their good behaviour, and are usually exceedingly careful to avoid such a course of conduct as would lead to the forfeiture of the custody of the children. It thus happens that the committal of a child to an industrial school sometimes proves beneficial to the parents as well as to the children.'[1]

The experience of England and Scotland as to the deterring effect on the parents of Boarding-out is repeated in the Colonies; there, too, demoralised parents have their proper or improper pride which is hurt by the substitution of the foster-home for the big school, or rather their selfish instinct which desires to retain control over the child for their own interested purposes. Mr. Guillaume's experience on this point is quoted in the New Zealand Report. 'One of the minor and incidental advantages of Boarding-out . . . is that while an unspeakable boon to the children, providing them with that family life which gives each one a home, it is very deterrent in its bearing on slothful and self-indulgent parents, and tends largely to reduce the number of the children thrown on the care of the State. Persons of the class referred to, who would be too ready to part with their children with a view to their entry into what is practically a large boarding school, where they could see them weekly, and look forward to again claiming them as they become old enough for work, hesitate now to part with their offspring under a system which enables the child's address to be effectually withheld from them until he has attained the age of 16 or 18, and has been some years settled in a country service home, earning his own livelihood.'[2]

The continuance of State Guardianship in the person of the Managers of Industrial Schools when necessary till the children attain legal majority at twenty-one is very valuable, but it is a power which must be used with tact and discrimination. The New Zealand Report for 1888 says,

[1] *Education Report; Industrial Schools and Orphanages*, 1884. Wellington.

[2] Letter to the *Herald*, June 3d, 1884. Quoted in the *Report* for 1884.

speaking of absconders: 'It is found that young persons otherwise well-conducted sometimes commit this offence because they feel that a stigma attaches to them while they are known to be under the legal control of the manager of an industrial school. This control was intended to protect them against unworthy persons who, if it were relaxed, would be their legal guardians, but the intention is not always understood or appreciated. It is now the practice of the department to move for the discharge of young persons when they appear to be quite capable of protecting themselves. The ages of the 19 absentees range from ten to twenty. They are all boys except one. Some of the cases are of long standing, and only nine have been added to their number during the year.'[1]

Though the authorities in New Zealand are thorough in the discharge of parental duties towards their State children, they do not assume these lightly, but are strict in looking up defaulty parents. 'With the sanction of the Hon. the Defence Minister, the officer in charge of every police station is appointed a person to take all necessary proceedings in the Court of Laws to recover maintenance money from the parents of committed children. When applications are made by parents or friends for the custody of children, the members of the police force in almost every case supply reliable information concerning the character of the applicants and advise the Department or the Managers of the schools as to the propriety or otherwise of granting the application.' So carefully are the children's parents inquired after, that among 320 committed children there was only one case where there was no information about either parent.

The State children generally declined in number between the beginning and the end of 1887 from 1609 to 1523. Of these 595 are returned as 'resident' or in schools, and 563 as boarded-out. The remainder have passed into the world, but are still under State control. Among the residents there had been three deaths, among those boarded-out only one.[2]

'This system has made its way even to the Antipodes,'

[1] *Report of the Minister of Education*, 1888. [2] *Ibid.*, 1884.

were the words in which in our first edition we referred to the small experiment in Boarding-out then recently begun in South Australia, little foreseeing the rapid development it was to attain in the Southern hemisphere, where each Colony, with the exception of West Australia, has adopted and elaborated the plan. This is noble compensation for disappointment with the slow progress made at home, and we trust will be a cheering record to workers convinced of the soundness of their principles, however tardy of acceptance.

CHAPTER IX

STATE CHILDREN IN FOREIGN LANDS

'The world is a vast house of correction where, willingly or unwillingly, mankind must, under an inexorable discipline, study the divine law of sacrifice.'—DEMETZ.

'Unless we keep guard over ourselves we always condemn the unfortunate.'—JOUBERT.

'The Germans say you must empty out the bathing tub, but not the baby along with it. Fling out your dirty water with all zeal and set it careering down the kennel; but try if you can keep the little child.'—THOMAS CARLYLE.

WHEN we examine the various methods of treating State children in European countries other than Great Britain and Ireland, and compare them with our own, we are at once conscious of a strongly marked difference. The systems of Public Relief pursued on the Continent are in many places, and in many ways, open to criticism; but the workhouse, with its moral and physical perplexities, and hereditary pauperism, disappears. The regulations for the children are less stereotyped; local organisations are not so strictly controlled by a central Government, and there is not the same institution-life, in the form of large pauper schools maintained by local taxation, and under the restrictions of a rigid code. The difference arises from England possessing a Poor Law, all her own invention; the originality which marks the Elizabethan age affected her so strongly that she departed from her cherished tradition, and promulgated important laws, destined to influence her social life to the core, without her usual reference to, and respect for, venerated precedents. The begging spirit and other

abuses, the outcome of profuse and indiscriminate almsgiving with which the first framers of our Poor Law had to deal, could not be immediately cured by merely checking general charity; and the rule then first definitely laid down, that the destitute had no claim to relief outside their own parish, seemed by implication to confer a moral, if not a legal, right to it within those boundaries. An evidence of this peculiarity of our Poor Law may be found in the special meaning which we give to the word 'pauper,' when used in its full significance, with its stigma of reproach. We have high authority for stating that 'pauper,' in the sense of the receiving, not merely requiring, relief, is unknown in any other tongue than the English.

So far as our own subject—that, viz., of the destitute children—is concerned, we think foreign methods are sounder in principle than our own. Where no legal compulsion to maintain the non-workers and their offspring at public expense has created an artificial system of relief, the local authorities naturally seek the simplest and cheapest method of providing for the orphan and deserted children thrown upon the community for support; and none is so simple and obvious, and at the same so little costly, as to put the forlorn little one into the care of an existing family. Hence one finds Boarding-out general abroad in a more or less developed and regulated form.

It prevails largely in France, the most thrifty perhaps of all countries, where public expenditure is jealously watched, and where improvidence is not fostered by a provision for the wasteful and the idle. But though in France the destitute have no legal claim to relief, the moral claim is not denied. Both the State and private persons contribute to the amelioration of poverty, either through voluntary organisation or through *L'Assistance publique*, of which there is a special department for children called the *Service des Enfants Assistés*. This Service has, however, no large schools, and but very few asylums; even the Department of the Seine, which for various reasons has charge of a third of the children receiving public aid in France, finds one *Dépôt Hospice* sufficient, Boarding-out being the rule.

This plan is known to have existed in France for several centuries, and the regulations under which it has long been conducted had their origin in the practice of sending children out of Paris and probably other large towns, immediately after birth, to be nursed in the country. An *Ordonnance* of the reign of King John (January 30th, 1450) regulates the salary of the nurses, and also the emoluments of the agents at Paris, called *racommanderesses*, who sought for and engaged them. In 1613, under Louis XIII, Letters Patent were issued confirming their rights and privileges to four racommanderesses, and prohibiting any addition to their number. In 1769, however, a dearth of nurses had arisen, owing, in part at least, to the non-payment of their salaries by the racommanderesses (a testimony, by the way, to the evils of State monopoly), and to remedy the deficiency a Government department was established, entitled *Le Bureau general des nourrices et des racommanderesses.* Inspectors were appointed to visit the nurses, but they were not active in the discharge of their duties; nor were the local medical officers, who superseded them, much better. At length, after the difficulties of the revolutionary period, during which the nurses were the object of much legislation, the Bureau passed, by the edict of the 29 Germinal, Year IX, under the control of the *Conseil Général des Hospices*, and thus arose the department for the care of destitute children, of which we have already spoken, Le Service des Enfants Assistés. In 1871 the Conseil Général des Hospices took measures to place this Service on an independent basis, as it had become too subordinate a branch of L'Assistance publique. Its importance has been yearly more fully recognised, and able and zealous men are devoting time, thought, and energy to improve and develop it.

As originally constituted, the Service had an office for nurses called *le Bureau Ste. Appolline*, which supplied nurses, not only for the children of the State, but also for such private families as chose to apply to it. It issued the rules which these nurses were to observe, and it provided inspectors, not only for the Enfants Assistés, but also fort he

Enfants Placés (as the children of private families are called), without extra charge to the parents. The regulations of the Bureau Ste. Appolline are curiously minute, relating to matters which we should expect to be left to individual sense and knowledge; but the French Government had become seriously alarmed at the frightful rate of infant mortality, and consequent threatened decrease of the population, and as this was in great measure attributed to ignorance and want of care in the nurses, stringent provisions were devised in the hope of remedy. The condition of the Enfants Assistés was materially improved, but as time went on the Enfants Placés proved a heavy drag on the Bureau. Private offices for supplying nurses to this class competed with it disastrously, and families belonging to the middle classes objected to avail themselves of it as bringing the stigma of public help. The Service has in consequence been entirely reorganised, and its operations limited to the children of the State, or, as they are sometimes called in France, Les Enfants de la Patrie.

When a poverty-stricken mother in Paris is unwilling or unable to support her child, she takes it to the department entitled the *Bureau de Secours*, which is always open, and states the reason for her visit. An officer, sworn to secrecy, receives the infant, asks its name and that of its parents, and its civil status, *i.e.* whether born in wedlock or not, but the mother need only answer the first question. She is then warned of the serious consequences of the step she contemplates, exhorted to fulfil her maternal duties, and after her case has been inquired into she is promised help, or, as we should call it, out-relief, provided she will suckle and take care of her child herself. Formerly this help was so small, and given only for so short a time, as to be practically valueless, the child frequently dying, or being again brought to the Bureau. It is now given, according to circumstances, generally for one or two years. The mothers (for the most part unmarried) in receipt of relief are visited by official ladies called *Dames visiteuses* (limited in number to two at present), who see that they fulfil the conditions on which it was given, instruct and encourage them in their

duties, and supply them with necessaries, a cradle being an important item.

If, however, the mother is determined to free herself from her child, it is taken entire possession of by the Service. She sees the little bone necklace, which must be worn till it is seven years old, fastened round its neck by a clasp in the form of a medal inscribed with the name of the Hospice (of reception), the year of desertion, and the registered number of the child, for its identification. Formerly these medals were stamped with the image of S. Vincent de Paul, but later information does not mention this.

By compliance with this simple form of State adoption, the mother gives up, for ever, her own maternal claims. Henceforth the child belongs to the State, and is never relinquished unless the parent or parents can fully establish their claim, repay all expenses, and satisfy the State authorities as to their moral fitness to take charge of the child, conditions very rarely fulfilled.

For the first four years after resigning her child, the mother is informed, if she chooses to inquire, every three months if it be alive or dead, well or ill, but nothing more; after that period, even this scanty information is withheld. No child can be abandoned, *i.e.* given up to the State, or adopted by it, after twelve years of age; and supposing a child should be sent to the Bureau instead of being taken there by its mother, it is adopted immediately, without any alternative help to her being offered. The State must also adopt destitute orphans and deserted children under twelve.

The first resting place of the little State children belonging to the Department of the Seine, *i.e.* Paris and its surroundings, is the Hospice Dépositaire, Rue Denfert-Rochereau, but its stay there is shortened as much as possible for its health's sake, and now rarely exceeds one day. It is quickly entrusted to a nurse residing in the country, a sufficient number of whom are constantly brought to Paris, under the escort of a *Surveillante*, an officer specially appointed for this purpose, to fetch their foster-children. They are also placed under the close

supervision of a medical practitioner in their own neighbourhood and a local officer, formerly called *sous inspecteur*, a title changed some years ago to that of *Agent de surveillance* and which it is proposed again to change to *Directeur d'Agence*. The children of the Department of the Seine are dispersed in districts called *circonscriptions*, formerly 22 in number. But in 1876 it was decided to limit the number in each to 1000, whether *Enfants Assistés* or *Enfants de Secours* (somewhat equivalent to our ins and outs), and seven new circonscriptions were in consequence created.

At the head of each circonscription is the Agent de surveillance, who is helped by clerks in the office work, but has multiform duties of his own. He acts in unison with the numerous local medical officers. He helps to choose nurses, giving preference to those who possess a cow or goat. He appoints the surveillantes, who must always be ready to escort nurses and children to and from Paris; examines these on their arrival in the country, and ascertains that the child wears its medal of identification. He keeps the accounts, watches over nurses and children, and communicates with the Maire, the Curé, and other influential persons in the neighbourhood, soliciting their friendly notice for the children.

Above the Agent de surveillance there are Controllers (auditors, as we should call them, but with some duties of supervision), who make surprise visits to examine the accounts; and, thirdly, the Departmental inspectors, appointed by the State, who go round at certain seasons to examine and report on the condition of the children.[1] There is a strong complaint, both in Dr. Thulié's interesting book and in M. Lallemand's[2] (our chief authorities), that these inspectors have frequently exceeded their power, and seized on the administration of the Service, instead of confining themselves to the work for which they were appointed.

[1] *Les Enfants Assistés de la Seine*, par Dr. H. Thulié, Paris. Bureaux des Progrès Médical, 14 Rue des Carmes, 1887.

[2] *La Question des Enfants Abandonnés et Delaissés*, L. Lallemand. Paris: A. Picard, 1885.

Such misappropriation was, however, at once checked in the Department of the Seine, where the Conseil Général (the ultimate authority, holding, in regard to Enfants Assistés, a position in some degree analogous with that of our Local Government Board) insist on the impropriety of inspectors reporting on work which they had themselves suggested, and were therefore sure beforehand to approve. They administer this epigrammatic rebuke—'The administration shall administer and the inspection shall inspect.'[1]

The duties of the medical officer are more onerous even than those of the Agents and Inspectors. He must recommend to the latter a sufficient number of nurses, examine each child on its arrival from Paris, entering its condition in a book, visit the young children monthly and the nurslings still oftener, attend those who are ill as often as may be needful, supplying medicines, etc., at his own cost. He has to keep the Agent de surveillance constantly informed of the state of the children, and to report to the central authority every three months upon their condition. Also it devolves upon him to take charge of the belongings of those who die. His payment for all this work is not high, though it has been recently increased; it now averages 1 franc for the monthly visit to each infant, 1 fr. 50 c. for the quarterly visits to the children from one to twelve, and 1 franc a visit to the children above 12. Medals of gold, silver gilt, and silver are also given as rewards for special devotion, and probably to stimulate zeal.[2]

Great precautions are taken to secure good and respectable nurses. The nurse to whom a State child is confided must produce a certificate from the authorities of the Commune that she is married, of good character, and in circumstances to take proper care of it. She must be between twenty and forty years of age, and is not permitted to take charge of an infant unless her own is nine months old, and has been weaned, a regulation found necessary for its protection. She is, moreover, subjected to three

[1] *Histoire des Enfants Abandonnés et Delaissés*, Lallemand.
[2] Dr. H. Thulié.

distinct medical examinations to test her fitness as wet-nurse.

The rates of payment were raised a few years ago, and are now for children aged from one day to twelve months 18 francs a month—about 14s. 6d. a month or 3s. 7d. a week. After the first year they decrease, for children from one to two years old, to 15 francs a month; from two to three, 12 francs; from three to four, 10 francs; from four to six, 8 francs; from six to nine, 7 francs; from nine to twelve, 6 francs. Dr. Thulié is doubtful if the increased rates are sufficient—they certainly fall far below what are considered adequate here. There are, however, occasionally special indemnities for extra expenses, but these seem to be given rather grudgingly. It must further be noted that these rates apply only to the Department of the Seine, and are larger than those elsewhere. In the provinces some Departments, in their anxiety to be economical, reduce payments to a dangerously low sum. The Inspector for the Departement d'Indre et Loire speaks in 1882 of 8 fr. 50 c. (about 6s.) a month as the general rate there, and this is reduced to 7 francs as soon as the child is seven years old. He mentions also some few other Departments which pay still less, giving only 3 francs a month (a penny a day) for the maintenance, washing, etc., of children from seven to twelve, and he points out how such miserliness must defeat its own purpose.[1] In another Department such minute inquiries were made about the relatives and circumstances of the children, and a pittance of relief to the mother instead of State-adoption so rigorously insisted on, that there was only one *Enfant Assisté* in the whole Department,[2] a state of things which experienced persons believe leads to much suffering and crime on the part of the unhappy mothers, especially the unmarried ones, who in France have to bear the whole burden of their sin, the father being in no way chargeable. The regulations in the Department of the Seine are far less stringent, and for this and other reasons it has to bear a great part of the cost strictly belonging to the provincial districts.

[1] Lallemand. [2] *Ibid.*

The nurse is bound to send her foster-child from six to fourteen years old regularly to school (the fees being paid by the Bureau) and for religious instruction, a certificate that she has done so being required; nurses who duly produce the certificate and can show that the children, received under one year old, have been well cared for and kept free from accident until twelve, obtain a reward of fifty francs. Clothing is provided by the Bureau of the Service, and the Reports contain the most elaborate tables of that supplied at different ages, with minutest calculations even to the thousandth fraction of a franc of the cost. The scale of payment for these outfits was changed in 1881. It is now 10 fr. 14 c. a year for infants up to three, and increases annually, according to age, until five. From that period sex is recognised in the distribution of garments, the boy assumes the lordly pantaloon, and costs in his sixth year for clothing nearly a third more than the weaker vessel, the respective averages being for girls 38 fr. 05 c., and for the boys 53 fr. 95 c.—about £1 : 10 : 5 and £2 : 3s. respectively. From six to seven, however, the girls cost the most, 47 fr. 39 c., and the boys only 37 fr. 91 c., but after this period the latter lead the way until the age of twelve is reached, when the supply ceases.[1]

The cost of the Service is defrayed from various sources —(1) Endowments, gifts, and legacies specially made to the charitable institutions of the Department for the benefit of the Enfants Assistés; (2) Fines from the police courts; (3) The budget of the Department; (4) The quota of the Communes; (5) The subsidy from the State, equal to a fifth of what are called 'the expenses of the interior service.' This means the Service of the depôt asylums, which includes all out-relief either to mothers or children. Inspection and surveillance are State charges. It is curious to note that this fifth of the expenses was originally intended to be the minimum of State help, but the financiers of the Government now declare it to be the maximum, and the Conseil Général is very pathetic over this and the difficulty of raising what it considers sufficient funds for the children.[2]

[1] Dr. Thulié. [2] Lallemand.

At the age of twelve the foster-child is eligible for apprenticeship, and the nurse, or probably her husband, frequently retains it in this relation. No premium is paid, and only in cases of illness any allowance for support, but the employer receives a lump sum for clothing; he has, however, to supply an outfit at the expiration of the apprenticeship. Occasionally he foregoes spending the money allowed him, in which case it is placed in a Savings Bank as a resource when the young person shall start in life; and the latter is urged to augment it henceforth from his own savings. The young people are encouraged in every way to remain in the country, and avoid the temptations and expenditure of town life.

The guardianship of the Conseil Général continues until its wards attain their majority. Its powers extend to rights of correction, emancipation from State Guardianship, consent to marriage, to military service, and administration of property. This last clause, which would be generally, though certainly not always, superfluous in England, is necessary in France, as children are there sometimes given up to State Guardianship for other reasons than that of destitution; and there have been a few cases where they have inherited considerable sums. Occasionally wealthy or childless people desire to adopt an Enfant Assisté, and then the consent of the Conseil Général is necessary. The children in request for adoption are mainly girls, with blue eyes and golden hair; Poor Law Guardians in England have a similar experience. In France one case at least has been known of the adopted child making a brilliant marriage conferring high social position, and, ignorant of her origin, giving herself grand airs. It is averred that the secret of the children's birth, and any circumstances concerning them confided to the officers who first receive them, have never been betrayed—though one of these officers is always a woman.

As a rule the Conseil Général has no cause to assert its powers as guardian until the children attain their majority or marry; and they grow up in happy ignorance of their origin, generally believing themselves the children of their

foster-parents. Tender ties of affection are formed, as was touchingly proved in 1827, when the then Minister Corbière, in order, as he stated, to correct certain abuses which had crept into the Service, commanded a general displacement of the children boarded-out in the country. It caused an outburst of pain and indignation among all classes. Most pathetic scenes occurred, and the final result was that many of the foster-parents, even the poorest, kept the children without payment sooner than part with them, while some of the infants, torn from the homes and the treatment to which they were accustomed, pined away and died. The effect was a great economy to the State—no doubt wished for, as Dr. Thulié grimly remarks.

The total number of the Enfants Assistés throughout France, as given by Lallemand, for 1884 was 46,178 from one day to thirteen years, and 35,799 from thirteen to twenty-one years old. Of these, 16,127 under thirteen, and 10,159 under twenty-one belonged to the Department of the Seine. Besides these, 37,973 children received temporary relief in the Departments generally while their parents were in prison or in the hospital.[1] This class are called *Enfants en Depôt*, and are usually kept at the Hospice Dépositaire till claimed.

The cost of the permanent Enfants Assistés averages now about £5 : 10s. per head per annum; but the Department of the Seine pays nearly half of the sum total, partly owing to its large population, partly to its more liberal allowances.[2]

M. Bruèyre and other influential public men organised, about eight years ago, a Board in the Department of the Seine for the care of neglected children over twelve, and for others who, though ill-treated by their parents, are not formally placed under State guardianship.[3] It is entitled Le Service des Enfants Moralement Abandonnés, and has done much valuable and interesting work, but as the

[1] *Histoire des Enfants Abandonnés et Delaissés*, L. Lallemand. Appendix.

[2] Dr. Thulié.

[3] *Rapport sur le Service des Enfants Moralement Abandonnés.* Paris: Montérrain, 1885. And *Les Services Publics de Protection de l'Enfance*, par Loys Bruèyre, Chef de la Division des Enfants Assistés de la Seine. Paris: 215 Boulevard St. Germain, 1886.

children it is intended to help are not, strictly speaking, State children, we cannot describe it here.

As the population of France is not increasing, we naturally do not find Emigration a prominent means for the disposal of State children. L'Abbé Brumauld, however, in 1852 tried to establish a colony of them in Algeria. Owing to radical defects, his project failed, but another scheme for a large colony of State children, who, from various causes, do not take root in their foster-homes, has been recently discussed. The late Abbé Roudil gave an estate on the express condition that the first school of agriculture should be established on it, and it is hoped that it will be thus occupied by 1889, M. Mayer, a member of the Conseil Général de la Seine, having devoted himself to the work.

The rate of infant mortality in France is still exceptionally high, and is attributed by Dr. Thulié to various causes, the chief being a wrong system of rearing, extreme ignorance of sanitary and physical laws, and a public opinion which creates a dread of large families and of wholesome struggle.[1] The population indeed, from the statistics of M. Lafabrégue, seems to be threatened with even fatal decrease. Basing his calculations on the years from 1869 to 1873, he found that England would (at the then rate of increase) double her population in 52 and Prussia in 67 years, while France was suffering from a decrease of one per cent, which would lead to total extinction in 600 years. In 1866 Dr. Brochard stated that, leaving aside the Enfants Assistés, 100,000 nurslings in France died annually of hunger, misery, and want of care; while at a later date Dr. Boudet declared before the Academy of Medicine that 120,000 from one day to a year old perished annually from preventible causes. In 1873-74 the municipal statistics showed that the deaths of children from one day to one year in Paris was 27 per cent.[2]

Mrs. Fletcher relates a visit in 1830 to the State Institution for Les Enfants Trouvés at Paris, which then received

[1] Dr. Thulié. [2] *Ibid.*

about 9000 new-born infants during the year. On the third day after reception, those still living were sent to foster-homes in the country, but *one-third* died before the time of departure arrived. Yet each infant had its separate crib, and the extreme of neatness pervaded the wards. 'There is no describing,' she says, 'the effect of the little wailing cries of the poor deserted babies; the low faint sound of distress from all sides was most appalling. One of the Sœurs de la charité was in the apartment; we involuntarily drew aside the curtains of one poor infant, whose low deep moanings were peculiarly affecting. The Sister lifted it up and said smiling, "It is dying." I besought her earnestly to give it some natural food, that of the breast. As the mouth of the child moved in search of it, she said with much sweetness and composure, "It has a sore mouth, and would infect the nurse. It is dying!" It was long before I could think of anything but the famished look of that miserable infant.'[1] Nine years after Mrs. Fletcher's visit the condition of the children seems to have been even more terrible. Mrs. Fry, who inspected the institution in 1839, compares the sound in the wards to the faint and pitiful bleating of lambs, and was told by a lady who frequently went there that she never remembered examining the array of clean white cots without finding at least one dead babe. The whole staff of officers seemed bound by tradition and custom, but Mrs. Fry succeeded in obtaining some amelioration of the treatment pursued.[2]

It may seem that we have laid unnecessary stress on this terrible sacrifice of life, seeing that State Infant Asylums are unknown in this country. But these are represented by our workhouses and pauper schools, and the appalling mortality at Dublin and Cork surpasses that of State children in any other part of the world. Though we trust and believe that destruction of life so terrible could never occur again within the three kingdoms, we must remember that wherever children, especially the very young, are massed together, there is an unseen but potent

[1] *Autobiography of Mrs. Fletcher.* Edmonston & Douglas, 1875.
[2] *Elizabeth Fry*, by Mrs. E. B. Pitman. London, 1884.

influence at work for their destruction; and we may be quite sure that it is stealing away many a little life in the nursery wards of our workhouses, however guardians and their officers may strive to save them.

Our own memory is haunted—not indeed by the low wail Mrs. Fletcher describes, for the tiny baby (one of many in a vast ward) we beheld was too feeble to utter a sound—but by an agonised face, gasping out its last breath, alone on its bed of perfect purity and neatness in the children's branch of a Destitute Asylum in Australia, closed now, thank God, by the extension of Boarding-out. It was not lack of proper nourishment solely to which these tragedies were due. It is now understood that the multiplied presence of babies is fatal to each other; while to most the personal warmth and cherishing of the mother's arms are as essential as food to their existence.

The mortality of Les Enfants Assistés was many years ago as high as 32 per cent. This was when the little infants were kept for some time in the Depôt before being sent into the country, the massing together of the babies proving certain death to many, and more or less injurious to most. The little ones are now often only kept there one night, and under recent enlightened administration the death rate of the Enfants Assistés (Department of the Seine) shows a constant decrease. In 1870 it was for those under twelve 8.88; the following year 6.67; and after some slight fluctuation it fell, in 1875, to 4.81. In 1877 it was 4.58—a slight increase on the previous year, accounted for by the exceptional severity of the winter of 1877. It reached its lowest point for ten years in 1878, when it was 4.47.[1]

In 1887 the number of children under the care of the Department was 27,982, and the deaths in the asylum 78, in the country 752. These satisfactory results testify to the wise efforts and devotion of the administrators and officers of the Department; and we trust that France may realise the truth which Dr. Thulié so emphatically enunciates, that her children of the State should be to her a source of

[1] Dr. Thulié. These are the latest statistics available, a census being now nearly due.

strength, and not of weakness, true 'Enfants de la Patrie,' absorbed into the working population, and with no further need for State help.

The Boarding-out system, we learn from M. de Liefde, has long been practised in the various countries of Germany, but in some parts insufficient care in the selection of homes, and the lack of efficient supervision, raised a hostile feeling towards it which led to the substitution of orphanages and other asylums. The defects, however, and the inadequacy in number, owing to the costliness of these establishments, were long ago painfully apparent to many German philanthropists, and to none more so than to Pastor Zeller of Beuggen. It became his aspiration, although his whole life may be said to have been devoted to the redemption of children by means of schools and asylums, that these should be superseded by a genuine family system. 'The Christian family,' he was wont to say, 'is the best reformatory.' Among the hearers he imbued with this doctrine was Andreas Bram, a native of Basle. He not only recognised in it the salvation of the child received into a home, but a reciprocal advantage to its benefactors by the opportunity thus afforded them of carrying into practical effect the teachings of Christ; and experience has proved his conviction to have been well founded. He was aware, however, that a class existed for whom the stricter discipline of an institution was necessary, and desired that these should be dealt with in reformatory schools. Entering the ministry, Pastor Bram was called, in 1835, to Neuekirchen, near Moers, in Rhenish Prussia. There he found public opinion entirely opposed to his views, and for ten years he contented himself with labouring to disseminate them, travelling for this purpose great distances, visiting leading men, and delivering lectures. The common objection urged was that no suitable families could be found, an objection, as we have seen, constantly raised in England when Boarding-out was first suggested. In 1845 the time seemed ripe for refuting it; a family in his own congregation was willing to adopt his plan, and a destitute child was entrusted to its care, a

small weekly sum for its board being paid partly by the community and partly by voluntary gifts. The experiment was perfectly successful, and soon it was repeated. In a short time twenty-five children were thus placed out in nine families. Some organisation now became needful for conducting the enterprise, and the 'Society for the Education of poor abandoned and neglected children in Christian families' was founded, with Pastor Bram for its president. The members sought suitable homes, and were even astonished at the number they met with, although the payment was purposely fixed low that there might be no temptation to pecuniary profit.

As the work spread, branch societies were formed, and in some districts an offer to Government was made and thankfully accepted, to undertake the supervision of children boarded-out by the public authorities. It was soon found necessary to have a house as a temporary refuge, while a suitable home was being selected, and one was hired for this purpose at Neuekirchen, the family character being still, as far as possible, maintained in its management. Friendly intercourse was kept up with the children after they were placed out in the world, and though some have failed to do well, a large majority are artisans and domestic servants of good character.

At Hamburg the Boarding-out system is pursued; and more than half the destitute children of Berlin are thus dealt with. The Code of Rules for the management of the latter, dated 1854, was confirmed by further regulations issued in 1866, and revised in 1878. The children are under the control of the Department which deals with Public Relief, but are directly cared for by small local committees, each consisting of not less than five persons, and called an 'Orphan Office.' The members—gentlemen and ladies entitled Warders and Wardresses (the designation 'Orphan fathers' employed in the last report expresses their powers somewhat quaintly), superintending respectively the boys at school, and the girls and little boys—are proposed by the Public Relief Board, and appointed by the local magistrates. They meet once monthly, when a member of

the Board has a right to be present for consultation; and twice in the year all the Orphan Offices hold a general conference under the presidency of the Head of the Orphan Department of the Public Relief Board.

There is an Orphan Office in each Public Relief district, and it is the duty of the Warders and Wardresses to verify the suitableness for the charge of children of the foster-parents (who must not be in receipt of alms or parish relief, and must comply strictly with all instructions given by the members for their district), to ascertain by frequent visits the condition, treatment, and regular attendance at school of the orphans, to report the same half-yearly to the central authority, and to pay the foster-parents their allowances. These, beginning at the rate of fifteen shillings per month, diminish as the children grow older.

The Board provides clothing for the babies, and also for children under six years of age, who have been well taken care of for six successive months by the same foster-parent. In case of illness the child is attended by the public medical officer. In addition to the close personal supervision expected from the Warders and Wardresses, the city districts are visited by the Public inspector, whose duty it is to point out to the different Orphan Offices any defect they may have observed, and if necessary report them to the Central Board.

The latest reports of the Central Board contain some very interesting remarks, the result of long experience. Since the law of March 13th, 1878, came into operation, the Department (like those in our colonies, already described) has had to deal with delinquent as well as destitute children. These are also boarded-out whenever possible; only the worst cases are sent to Reformatory schools, children principally who would contaminate others. The period of supervision over these children has recently been extended till they are eighteen years old.

In consequence of the general adoption of Boarding-out, no new Orphanage has been opened at Berlin since that for boys only, at Rummelsberg, notwithstanding a very large increase of the population and a proportional increase of

destitute children. It is, however, now proposed to build a school for criminal or vicious children unfit to be put into families, and who have up till now been placed in private institutions, chiefly founded and maintained by different religious sects.

The experience gained during a long period of years at Berlin is very valuable. There has been no lack of good foster-parents, who belong chiefly to the better class of labourers, mechanics, etc., much as in England. The Government Inspector of Education reports that under the softening influences of home life children who here would be committed, if not to the Reformatory, certainly to the Industrial School, gradually assimilate themselves to the better brought up children with whom they come into contact. Delinquent children are sent as far away as possible from Berlin and from their relations; the boys do best chiefly in the country, but the girls are most sought after by foster-parents residing in small towns. It is much wished by the authorities that the girls should all take situations as servants, but only a small number choose this form of livelihood; the majority prefer the greater freedom and more easily learnt work of factory life, a melancholy experience now in many countries.

The reception of young delinquents now causes the State children of Berlin to fall into four classes. (1) Children temporarily or permanently deprived of one or both parents. (2) Children brought before the magistrate for committal for reformatory education (only the worst cases being sent to the Reformatory schools). (3) Children whose parents, grossly neglecting their up-bringing, are deprived of parental authority; and also children whose behaviour is doubtful, but does not necessitate reformatory treatment. (4) 'Former orphans' who prove from incapacity unable to gain their own living, and therefore are confided to public care. The members of this last class are a very small minority, being given in the return for 1886 as only seventeen.[1] For so large a town as Berlin, the per-

[1] *Reports for* 1884-87 *of the Department of Public Relief dealing with Orphans.* Berlin.

centage of reformatory children and of those belonging to class 3 is also small, being stated in the same return as 326 and 34 respectively; the number of orphans is given as 4679, but this represents the readmission of temporary cases.

In the Ministerial Decree referring to the Amended Acts of 1878 an appeal is made to the co-operation of existing charitable institutions and associations, supported by the following words: 'I acknowledge with pleasure the satisfactory results thus obtained in analogous work. Indeed, Poor Relief is nowhere more effectually administered than in those communes where, in the public interest, the co-operation of charitable persons has been secured by the administration, where, in short, the action of the authorities and of individuals has been in unison.'

The moral, physical, and economic results of boarding-out the Berlin children who are in receipt of public relief under the Department dealing with orphans are reported to be very satisfactory, but its administration need not be described in greater detail, as it resembles the method in use elsewhere, viz. a Depôt for reception, including quarantine and medical treatment when required, followed by transference to foster-homes, or, if necessary, reformatory discipline.[1]

One of the most celebrated Orphanages in Germany is that of Rummelsberg, near Berlin, which has existed in its present form for more than twenty-five years. We were indebted for information concerning it for the first edition of this book to Herr Zelle, formerly at the head of the Orphan department at Berlin, procured for us by the distinguished jurist, Baron von Holtzendorff. In communicating it to us he wrote: 'We have a mixed system; part of our destitute children are educated in orphanages, part are given in charge to trustworthy cottagers or dwellers in towns. Berlin has a large orphanage in its rural vicinity, consisting, however, of several distinct houses. The spot is called Rummelsberg. There are five houses for 50 boys each (250 children), two houses for girls (100), a department for the agricultural training of girls between fourteen and fifteen (50), a nursery for children under seven

[1] *Histoire des Enfants Abandonnés.*

(30), a hospital (containing now 30 children), an establishment for the reception of children affected with chronic diseases (20)—in all, 480 children. The result of my own observation, and the opinion of my friend M. Zelle, are as follows. Both systems, when well administered, may do; it depends on circumstances which ought to be preferred. It is desirable to have both, and to make a proper selection of children before subjecting them to either. For boys a *combined* educational training in a common establishment works well; for girls *individual* treatment is decidedly better than keeping them in Orphanages.' It would appear that the conviction here expressed of the need of home life for girls has led to a change of arrangement, as a recent Report, that for 1884, speaks of the institution being exclusively devoted to boys born in wedlock, except so far as the Invalid House is concerned, which takes girls also. 500 is the total number of children received.

In a very interesting little pamphlet published in Berlin in 1867, M. Zelle gives a graphic account of the sufferings of the orphans in the Middle Ages, and the shifts which were resorted to to obtain money for them,—first by authorised begging, afterwards by the cruelly hard work of the children who had to maintain themselves and the institutions. Their only recreation was singing, chiefly hymns and psalms, and even this was at one time turned to account, for the music of the orphans was believed to be an excellent cure for all kinds of bodily aches and pains, a faith revealed by entries of payments for singing songs to different persons that they might obtain relief from toothache, bad eyes, etc. All this is happily of the past, and certainly the children at Rummelsberg are well cared for, and have as much freedom as it is possible to give them. M. Zelle relates startling instances of the uncivilised and shocking habits of some of them, and of their gradual improvement. One of his remarks will, we are sure, be endorsed by all who have had much to do with institution children—on the difficulty, namely, which managers and teachers experience from what he calls their 'two

faces,' their institution face and another, probably their own. Many of them seem to possess two natures also—the one obedient, conforming to the rules of the institution, successful at lessons, and showing a respectful manner to those in authority; the other evidently the old Adam of early associations, tricky, unprincipled, and often thievish. The grave problem is which of these two natures will ultimately gain the upper hand; and one wonders if the more favourable is assumed from interested motives as a protection, or perhaps even as an amusement. There is, we fancy, many a Strange case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde in these institutions.[1]

Most of the religious congregations of Germany have their own Orphanages, and there are besides training Homes on the plan of the far-famed Rauhe Haus near Hamburg, founded by Dr. Wichern. There the children, originally assembled round his own hearth, have, as their numbers increased, been lodged in separate cottages, containing from perhaps twelve to twenty-five, brought up, so far as circumstances permit, under the influences of home-life. The Rauhe Haus suggested to Demetz the organisation of Mettray, and Mettray, as we have seen, was proposed by Mr. Doyle as a model for pauper schools on the Cottage-Homes plan. The German and French institutions were devised and directed by men of genius inspired by the noblest enthusiasm, and achieved results never yet, we believe, equalled under like conditions; yet a recent writer, Dr. Föhrung, objects, we think with reason, that the system is costly, and does not truly reproduce family life, since children of the same age only—he might have added generally of one sex also—are grouped together; and he prefers boarding-out in the families of agricultural labourers.[2] This preference, it would seem, is shared by many of his countrymen, for in different parts of Germany Orphanages have been closed and their inmates boarded-out. Of how

[1] *Waisenpflegeund Waisenkinder in Berlin*, von R. Zelle. Berlin, 1869.

[2] Quoted by Lallemand, *L'Histoire des Enfants Abandonnés et Delaissés.*

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

this came about with one of them Miss Preusser tells the touching story. During the Prussian-Austrian war in the summer of 1866, when the hospitals of Leipzig were already filled with wounded soldiers, and trains bringing more were hourly expected, the Bürgermeister and Town Council appealed to the townsfolk, stating that they needed the Orphanage temporarily for the sick, and asking them meanwhile to take charge of the children, promising that all expenses should be refunded when the orphans were returned. In one day all the orphans had been taken into the citizens' houses, and the Orphanage converted to its new use.

When at length the wounded soldiers were discharged the Bürgermeister issued a second proclamation calling upon those who had received the orphans to bring them back, and claim the amounts due for their maintenance. The heads of the families appeared, but one and all declared they could not part with the children—they had become too fond of them. Only in a very few instances, where the people were extremely poor, was any payment accepted. The Bürgermeister then appointed a trustworthy man as 'Orphan father,' whose duty it was to keep a register of all the orphans thus boarded-out or adopted, to visit them at their homes and ascertain their progress at school, assuring himself of their general welfare, and to report it quarterly to the proper authority.[1]

As the duties of supervision over those dwelling in families grew too onerous for one person to perform, more 'Orphan fathers' were appointed to share them, and the office now is mainly, if not entirely, filled by ladies, upon whom also has devolved the somewhat incongruous title assigned to it.

Instead of three or four hundred children, the Orphanage now contains as permanent residents only a few who from

[1] This narrative is quoted by Professor Ingram in his valuable Papers on the 'Boarding-out of Pauper Children,' read before the Irish Statistical Society, and published in their Journal for December 1875 and February 1876. The story was put into graceful verse by the late Menella B. Smedley.

severe bodily or mental infirmity, or bad or vicious habits, are deemed unfit for private care.

Among the many subjects that engaged the benevolent and enlightened attention of Princess Alice in her German home was the condition of the destitute and parentless children, who, according to the ancient custom of the country, were handed over to the charge of humble families willing to take them for payment. She found that scant care was exercised in choosing the foster-parents, and very little if any supervision was given afterwards; she also learned that the rate of payment was below what would afford the necessaries of life. Some of the children thus placed were nevertheless well cared for and kindly treated, showing a generosity and self-sacrifice on the part of the foster-parents which deeply impressed her; but others were neglected and suffering. She obtained information on Boarding-out from places where the plan was well administered, and then interested those around her in the subject. The knowledge she had gained enabled her to reorganise on a sound footing the method pursued in Hesse. The various town and country communities pay for their respective orphans boarded-out, and the sums allowed were now made adequate to the necessities of the children, while a proper selection of homes and due surveillance of the little boarders was secured in the following manner.

Princess Alice invited four of the ladies of her Court to aid her in carrying the new scheme into effect, and having fully explained it to them, asked them each to impart it to four of their friends, with a request that they would likewise make it known to others. She thus quickly created a staff of competent administrators throughout the State, who, acting with her while she was yet with them, still carry on the noble task she bequeathed. One consequence of their labours is that no large Orphanage now exists in Hesse.

The Boarding-out Society thus called into being became a branch of the Alice Frauen Verein, which under the presidency of Princess Louis of Battenberg carries on and

further develops the enterprises for the benefit of the poor and suffering initiated by Princess Alice.

The condition of a very pitiable class of children, the illegitimate, who are put out to nurse by their parents—usually the mother—caused the State in 1882 to pass a law whereby these are brought under the supervision of the police from the day of their birth until they have attained their sixth year. Finding that important items in the care of these children were beyond the sphere or control of police officers, the State asked the Alice Frauen Verein to give its aid. A separate Committee of the Association was therefore formed at Darmstadt, the members of which visit the children, advise the police if they deem a change of foster-parents necessary, and exercise a moral control over the latter. The children being mostly of the poorer classes, and their mothers often not remaining in the town, the help of the police is invaluable to obtain needful information about them. When the children reach their sixth year, the State, as we have seen, ceases to occupy itself directly with them. Education being from that age compulsory, they are obliged to go to school, and it is considered that the control of the School officers replaces the control of the police. Nothing more would be wanted if the cases of these children were as simple as that of the orphans. Unfortunately this is not so. If indeed the children are paupers, the town is responsible for them, and pays for their maintenance and they pass into the hands of the branch of the Alice Society, which supervises the town orphans. But where a pension is paid by the father or mother, this control cannot be exercised. The children rarely remain long in the same family unless related to it, and the pensions are irregularly paid. These risks exist indeed from the time of the poor child's birth, but so long as the police have authority they may be to a great degree remedied. When that ceases, however, the Committee receives no further information of a change of foster-parents, or other circumstances concerning the child, often unavoidably losing sight of it, and then chance decides whether it be properly cared for or not.

The information we have been enabled to give of the

method pursued in Hesse for the protection of illegitimate children is cited, by permission, from a letter from Princess Louis of Battenberg to Miss Octavia Hill. The Princess concludes: 'If money and time are spent in keeping such children alive until their baby years are safely passed, surely it is but wise if afterwards care is taken to bring them up decently. Otherwise the State has only saved the life of members who sooner or later must become a burden to it in the shape of paupers, vagabonds, or criminals.' Her Grand Ducal Highness is anxiously seeking means whereby the control and protection needed to secure the children's permanent welfare may be supplied.

The helpless class in which Princess Louis is thus actively interesting herself has unhappily a large counterpart among us, which equally needs State protection. It is true a considerable proportion drift sooner or later into our workhouses, where they are dealt with precisely as are other pauper children; but of many who do not come into its keeping, it cannot be doubted the lot is often one of suffering and degradation such as ought not to be permitted in our land, while a large number die miserably from want of proper care. We hope the narrative of what is done for them in Hesse will rouse attention to their needs here; and that either the same plan extended to meet the deficiency pointed out by the Princess, or one more exactly adapted to our social conditions if that be held unsuitable, will be adopted for their relief.

The history of the great Orphanage of St. Petersburg, founded during the social and political excitement roused by the French Revolution, is a curious illustration of that doctrinaire period. In the latter half of the last century a Russian philanthropist, named Betzky, in many ways a man of genius but more generous than prudent, struck by the sufferings and the large proportion of deaths among the children of the poor, especially the illegitimate, devised a plan of bringing them up in large establishments, educating them carefully, and creating of them a middle class between the aristocrats and serfs,—the only classes then existing in

Russia. He interested the Empress Catherine II in his ideas, which were in harmony with the prevalent spirit of the age, and two vast establishments called Houses of Education were opened, one in Moscow in 1766, and the other just outside St. Petersburg in 1770. The aim of their originator was, however, never attained; the mortality in the St. Petersburg hospital was, in the first fifteen months after its opening, two-thirds of the whole; and in twelve years 6606 of the 7709 infants admitted had died. As some of this mortality was attributed to exposure during the winter while on the way to the building, which was some little distance from the city, the establishment was transferred, in 1784, to a more central position in St. Petersburg itself, but the slight decrease in the mortality obtained by the children's escaping the cold of the short journey to the suburbs was more than compensated by the greatly increased numbers of desertions by mothers tempted by greater facilities for abandonment. The few survivors from these two institutions brought up in these unnatural conditions turned out thoroughly ill.

In 1797 the Empress Mary undertook the reform of the Orphanages. This she effected in two ways; she limited the number of children to be received at St. Petersburg, at the same time enlarging and improving the building to prevent overcrowding, and she boarded-out the rest with agricultural labourers. Lallemand, from whom the above account is taken, adds, 'The remedy was found. Instead of the pretentious education of the original institution, the deserted child was placed in the only conditions which suit it, those of a rural family.'

That these reforms proved successful we know from the late Baron de Bode, who informed us: 'We have a public institution framed somewhat on the plan you mention, of placing orphans to board among cottagers. Children are sent from the Foundling Hospital in St. Petersburg into rural districts to be brought up in peasants' families; they are supported by the funds of the Hospital. Central stations are erected in the country, with infirmaries to which children placed in the neighbourhood can resort

when ill; there they also receive their elementary education; and when they become of the right age they choose their own trade, and receive a stipulated sum to set them up in life from their guardians—the authorities of the Foundling Hospital. Marriages are encouraged, mostly among themselves,—I believe even portions are established for that purpose; and for those who have a turn for agricultural pursuits land is granted by Government. But there is one great drawback in this, in other respects, benevolent plan. It creates a sordid spirit among mothers of the rural population, much to the detriment of their own offspring, who are often neglected by them for fear of losing the stipend granted for the care of the nursling. It has been observed, in those localities where orphans are given out to nurse, the population is on the wane. However, with proper management, the defect might be obviated.' This defect seems peculiar to Russia, and is probably caused by too high payment, giving the nursling a commercial value.

Other evidence tends to show that Boarding-out is very generally practised in Russia, needing, however, apparently far more careful supervision than appears usually to be given. Odessa, however, would seem to afford a favourable instance. It has a Depôt hospital, which receives about 300 children annually. These are immediately boarded-out in the country: cases of adoption are not rare, and the foster-home is said always to remain open to the child after payment ceases, viz. when it attains its eleventh year.[1]

In Italy, under the temporal government of the Pope, there were large Orphanages for the reception of destitute children, including the well-known one for foundlings at Rome, under direct papal patronage. But, though carefully built and organised, the mortality among the infants retained in this establishment is high, and as a rule they are boarded-out as quickly as possible. At the age of twelve they are, or perhaps we should now say they used to be, transferred to convents—a plan, Lallemand says, which, as might have been expected, impaired the spirit of self-

[1] *Histoire des Enfants Abandonnés.*

reliance, and led, particularly among the girls, to the lack of vigorous and sustained efforts to support themselves. Visiting some years ago a convent, recently converted to secular purposes, at Rome, we observed in the vast kitchen some aged female forms cowering round the great fire-place, and on asking who they were, we were told they were 'orphans.' They were the residue of young girls brought up in the convent, who had failed in after life, and were charitably allowed a shelter for the remainder of their days.

The method throughout the Italian kingdom now is generally a depôt asylum for the first reception of the children, and then boarding-out in peasant families. In the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies the experiment was made in 1800 of reversing the plan—namely, keeping the children in the Hospital. Three hundred nurses and six hundred children were permanently maintained in the building at S. Annunziata, in Naples,—only those who were lucky enough to be taken charge of by charitable private families being sent out. The subsequent mortality was frightful; of 2259 infants, 1831 had died by 1809. Nevertheless the plan was persevered in till 1822, when the hospital of S. Annunziata became again a simple depôt asylum.

In Switzerland relief is strictly limited to the natives of the respective cantons or communes in which it is administered, analogous, to a great extent, to our own method. The laws against pauperism are, however, very stringent. One forbidding any person in receipt of relief to marry was indeed repealed in 1874, but those prohibiting a pauper from frequenting public-houses and from exercising any political rights are still in force. In regard to the State children, the system of dealing with them varies according to ancient customs and the circumstances of the canton. In Lucerne, Schaffhausen, and one or two others, boarding-out is the rule. The Poor Law officials supervise the children, while the school teachers have to report school attendances. State aid is continued till the children are sixteen, or have been admitted to the Holy Communion. Other cantons, as for instance, Appenzell,

Bâle-Campagne, St. Gall, and Geneva, send them to communal asylums, on the ground that boarding-out is difficult in an artisan population. Lallemand does not give a glowing account of these establishments, and from his account they seem to be as defective as our own workhouses. In most of them the separation of adults and children is incomplete. He thinks School asylums should be established for the children; but the question is constantly shelved because of the expense. Certain communes have, however, combined lately to build such an asylum, with, as it is believed, good moral and hygienic conditions.

In the Netherlands, previous to the separation of Holland and Belgium, a system for dealing with State children was established resembling, in all essentials, that now in operation in France; but for a time, as regards Holland, the well-known Home-colonies, originated in 1817 by General Van der Bosch, afforded a different method of dealing with those who had parents, as they accompanied them to these establishments. In the penal colonies this plan has long, we believe, been abandoned; but as members of families sent to the free colonies, and as orphans boarded with those of the colonists who are considered fit to have charge of them, a certain number of State children are still thus brought up. The remainder of the class designated 'pauper' with us are usually boarded-out in agricultural districts at an outside cost of about £6 a year, for which, we are assured on high authority, excellent homes can be secured. At Amsterdam (and, we believe, the same rule prevails elsewhere) children are not allowed to remain even temporarily in the poorhouse. They are immediately despatched to an Orphan Asylum, which is now merely used as a depôt from which they are boarded-out.

In Belgium the value of boarding-out is estimated even more highly in regard to boys than to girls; so that, while at the Hospice des Enfants Assistés, at Brussels, a considerable number of girls are retained for domestic training, instruction in needlework, etc., *all* the boys, the Director informed us, are boarded-out. As in Holland, for about

£6 a year, including school, clothing, etc., homes can be secured in such abundance that there is no need to accept any that are not thoroughly good.

In the southern provinces of Austria, Boarding-out shows a different phase, which reduces it very much to a mere scheme of out-relief. In Vienna there is a very large Maternity Hospital, originally founded by Joseph II, where many of the class of destitute children are born. Both these and the children fathered on the State in other ways are boarded-out, but as far as possible they are all placed with their own mothers, or with nurses living close to the mothers; sometimes, however, with other relations, or persons chosen by the mother. In this respect the Boarding-out of Austria differs from that of other European nations where the child, once adopted by the State, is severed as much as possible from parents and relations from whom all knowledge of its situation is usually concealed, partly that it may form new relationships, but also that a too ready recourse to State aid may be discouraged; reasons, as we have seen, causing the authorities in Scotland to withhold the addresses of boarded-out children. Supervision is curiously shared in Vienna between the parents, or, in case of their death, other relations, the municipalities, and the clergy as representatives of the Hospital. The authorities may withdraw a child from a home where they suspect neglect or ill treatment, and the nurses on their side may give up their charges after due notice. When children have attained the regulation age they become, like other destitute persons, chargeable to their respective communes, unless adopted or retained without payment by their foster-parents. But these nurses have the right to keep their charges till twenty-two to help them in cultivating their land, or in their trade.

The age fixed for the Guardianship of the Hospital to cease was formerly ten, but in 1883 was reduced to six in the case of children confided to the care of mother, grandmother, aunt, or other relation on the mother's side. The present rate of payment is 4 florins (nearly 8s.) a month

for the first year; 3 florins, 34 kreuzers (6s.) the second year; and 2 florins, 66 kreuzers (5s.) a month, from three to six.[1]

In Hungary and Galicia there are public orphanages, but the children under the care of the State are placed out within their own communes, in the families of peasants and artisans; the public doctors, or, as we should call them, the Union medical officers, supervising their sanitary conditions. Parents contribute towards the maintenance of their children when able to do so. A medical examination is made of the person and household of any one offering herself as nurse; and no nurse is allowed to receive more than one foster-child. There are besides many private charities for the reception of destitute or very poor children.[2]

In Spain, where the children are the special objects of religious charity, there are depôt asylums for their reception, and they are thence boarded-out with peasant women of good character. Infant mortality is high, but not exceptionally so among the State children.[3]

In Sweden there are no special regulations for the treatment of State children as distinct from other destitute persons. The universal practice is, however, for each town to have a small depôt for their reception, whence they are placed out in families.

It will be seen from this very short summary that boarding-out State children in foster-homes is in some form or other of universal usage on the Continent, and in most cases of considerable antiquity. May it not afford one reason why in countries other than England paupers, as we understand the term, do not form a distinct and, we may add, privileged class?

Many interesting details of the methods in the different countries have necessarily been omitted from want of space; but even from these scanty notices it will be seen how extremely elastic the plan is, and how it can be adapted to widely varying customs and different systems of law. It will be seen too how, in every climate and under every rule, the moral and sanitary evils of big institutions for children, and

[1] *Histoire des Enfants Abandonnés.*
[2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.* [4] *Ibid.*

particularly for infants, are reproduced with unvarying monotony, showing that the mischief is inherent in the scheme itself, and cannot be charged to casual defects of administration.

It has been noticed that the Latinised races who retain the Roman Catholic faith think most of the infants, the Protestant nations of the older child. Thus amongst those abiding by the former creed will be found more ancient and numerous establishments for foundlings and deserted infants, while the latter are better endowed with schools. Another evidence of this is the age at which State aid ceases. It is lower among the Latin than among the Saxon peoples. In France the limit is at present twelve, and until quite recently no help other than private charity was given above that age. Lately, however, Le Service des Moralement Abandonnés has taken the Paris *gamins* in hand; but strictly speaking this is not a State organisation, though deriving some of its funds from the State.

We are glad to record that there is an almost universally awakened interest in the question of State Guardianship, a gratifying tendency in the different peoples to profit by the experience and advantages of others, and an earnest desire to remedy defects in their own systems; and that while France is arousing herself in behalf of her older children, England, America, and Australia are daily becoming more alive to the claims and sufferings of their destitute and neglected infants.

The history of State children in foreign lands, of which we have been able to give but a brief notice, is deeply interesting, with side lights of great value. In these matters enlarged knowledge and experience are essential to sound judgment. When we find nations differing in origin, living under various forms of government, and educated in divergent religious beliefs, seeking to solve a difficult social problem, and all of them without preconcerted action or special communication lighting on one and the same solution, we may safely conclude that that solution must be the best, based in the universal needs of our common human nature asserting themselves above all temporary and external differences of creed and politics, country and race.

CHAPTER X

OUT-DOOR PAUPER CHILDREN AND INS AND OUTS

'We all know from unhappy experience that knowledge is not virtue, much less is elementary education, and that education alone does not give the power of resisting temptation.'—W. E. FORSTER.

'Children not so much born as *damned* into the world.'—SOUTH.

'And were I the chooser, a dram of well-doing should be preferred before many times as much the forcible hindrance of evil-doing.'—JOHN MILTON.

BESIDES the class of children of whom we have already spoken, there is another and a far larger one with whom Poor Law Guardians have to deal—those, namely, on out-relief, but who (under the regulations observed in most Unions) are not, strictly speaking, State children, as they live with their parents or friends, and are only in part supported by the public. In so far as these children are taken into pauper schools or boarded-out under the Local Government Board Order, they form an exception from this rule, but the number is at present small, and serves only to prove it.

In some respects, especially if their parents be vicious or negligent, these little creatures left in their keeping are more unfortunately placed than those wholly dependent; but under one important aspect they are less unhappy—they are not forlorn waifs and strays stranded out of reach of the tide of domestic affection, but are members of existing families.

The question how best to deal with children on out-relief has always been beset with peculiar difficulties and

dangers, though some of these have disappeared of late years. Out-relief was formerly given with less supervision than is now usual, and relief and education were disassociated. The Poor Law was interpreted even to forbid making attendance at school a condition of parish help. The money granted as out-relief for the children was often spent by the parents on their own vicious indulgences, while the children roamed the streets and starved. Among the remedies applied was one described by the Rev. G. Hans Hamilton (the present Archdeacon of Northumberland) as in operation in his parish of Berwick-upon-Tweed, where he was Chairman of the pauper school Committee.[1] Children on out-relief dwelling near enough to the workhouse were admitted as free day-scholars, the teachers and relieving officers reporting on the regularity of their attendance, which in fact exceeded that of the pupils of other schools in the town. Their numbers were far greater than those of the indoor children, whom they seemed to inspire with some of the energy of free life.

The provisions, indeed, of Denison's Act, passed in 1854 to enable Guardians to pay the school fees of outdoor juvenile paupers dwelling beyond the reach of workhouse schools, had been suggested by Mr. Hamilton, though he would have made them compulsory instead of merely permissive.

The late Rev. W. L. Clay, in a Paper on the Education of Neglected and Destitute Children, read before the Social Science Association of 1866, advocated the passing of an Act authorising Guardians to refuse outdoor relief for children unless they attended a school under Government inspection.[2] But he knew how Denison's Act, successfully worked by the Chairman and his colleagues of the Berwick Board of Guardians, had been almost a dead letter in the country generally, only about 7000 out of more than 200,000 children having profited from it. And he knew the cause, —the reluctance of Guardians to spend the rates upon education. He proposed, therefore, that the fees to be paid

[1] *Journal of the Workhouse Visiting Society*, Sept. 1860.
[2] *Transactions*, 1866.

under his scheme, in the first instance by them, shou recoverable from the Committee of Council or other de ment of the State; which would in fact have been education grant for the poorest and most ignorant class o the nation.

The Elementary Education Act, supplemented by the Amending Act of 1873, superseded these and other methods; but it was in the Amending Act that Mr. Forster carried, against strong opposition, the vital point that no relief should be given for the maintenance of any child between the ages of five and thirteen unless it were receiving elementary education.

To secure attendance at school is not, however, alone sufficient to prevent out-relief for children working them harm instead of good; the circumstances of the home must also be rigidly considered. If it is one where idleness and disorder prevail, and perhaps drunkenness and dishonesty too, certainly the child should be removed; but if its conditions are decent, and its members honest, industrious, and kindly, and if knowledge that the child is dependent on the rates be kept from it (most difficult to do, but essential to avoid generating a pauper spirit), we hold that it will receive there a far better training for after life than if transferred to the pauper school. The latter is the only resource now available in Unions where out-relief has been discontinued; and the discontinuance of out-relief, in its bearing on the diminution of pauperism, is a question of such vast importance, that no side-issue, even one of such gravity as the best method of upbringing the children, can be allowed to override it. Rather must we earnestly seek some means by which the two ends can be successfully achieved.

Transference to the pauper school has, as regards town children, the great advantage of removal to pure air, while to all it assures sufficiency of food, personal cleanliness, and instruction more or less satisfactory. But the growing feeling in favour of home, however poor and humble, as compared with institution life for children, looks distrustfully on this substitute, and hopes that a wider application of Boarding-out will hereafter supply a better.

The number of children on out-relief so far exceeds that of the indoor children that, looking simply to its effect in checking pauperism, the method of dealing with them is one of the first importance. On the 1st of January 1888 that number was 212,913 (including 3551 boarded-out). Of these, 118,976 were dependent on widowed mothers.[1] It is this class that are more and more receiving relief in the form of admission to the pauper school; and it will therefore be seen that the extension of that method is most serious, as demanding a vast increase of school accommodation. It is true that the proffered admission is frequently refused by the mother, who prefers to struggle on and maintain her children as best she may without parish help, rather than part with them; still a sufficient proportion accept it to make enlargement or multiplication of the schools indispensable, should the practice of offering it become general.

There are, too, in addition to this class of children (but still exclusive of 10,699 orphans and others relieved without their parents), the balance of the whole number, namely, 83,238, who, while living with relatives, are receiving out-relief more or less temporarily, and who, in proportion as this form of relief is increasingly discontinued, must be provided for otherwise. If we have by the evidence adduced in earlier chapters imbued our readers with the conviction that pauper schools are, with rare exceptions, costly failures, they will share our hope that before fresh and vast expense is incurred to increase school accommodation, the merits of alternative courses will be carefully considered. Mr. Clay, in the Paper we have cited, showed his belief that the solution of the question he dealt with lay in making education compulsory, but despaired in 1866 of such a measure as too stringent and arbitrary for English deference to individual freedom and parental rights. Yet within seven years the seemingly unattainable was accomplished.

Let us take courage from his miscalculation, and trust that delivery from 'the tyranny of bricks and mortar,' in the form of our barrack schools, may be at hand.

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1887-88.

Deference to the claim of parents to 'do what they like with their own' in the matter of education having been swept away, we are confronted with 'parental rights' in another form. Children are maintained and educated by the State, but at the parents' will must be restored to them, even if they come straight from gaol to fetch them, and will take them to the lowest haunts of vice. But the period of calm compliance with a law at once so cruel and so illogical is past, and dissatisfaction, deepening to indignation, grows day by day among those compelled to administer it.

In 1886 the St. Pancras Board formulated a Resolution asking for an extension of the power of Guardians over this class of children. The Marylebone and Paddington Boards took similar action. In March 1887 the Guardians for Whitechapel, when endorsing a Resolution from the Marylebone Board, declared themselves 'further of opinion that legislation should be invoked in the larger direction of saving children from future pauperism, crime, and immorality by a more adequate provision than at present [exists] for the enforcement of parental responsibility; and failing this, for securing the withdrawal of children from the custody and control of vicious and negligent parents; and that, in the opinion of this Board, where the legal custody and control of a child may be withdrawn from a parent by Magisterial Warrant, the deprivation of right should be held to extend up to the age of 21 years, so as to afford the requisite protection to a child in the early years of work, and to secure the formation of good habits.'

These Resolutions in the usual course reached the Local Government Board, but without apparent result. In October of the following year the Guardians of Barton Regis gave a more definite form to the appeal by passing a Resolution to the effect 'That in the case of a child who has been chargeable to one or more Unions for a period of one year or upwards (the time for Ins and Outs, reckoning from their first admission to any Workhouse), Guardians of the Union should have power to apply to the Justices for an order to commit such child until the age of 18, either

to their own Guardianship, with power to emigrate, board-out, or otherwise dispose of such child; or to a Certified Industrial School. And in such case the control of such child by its natural parents should, as a consequence of such order, be transferred to the Guardians of the Union, or to the Managers of the Certified Industrial School, as the case may be, the parents being ordered to contribute, if able to do so. . . . That on such an application being made by the Guardians of a Union, the Justices must be satisfied that the Guardianship of such child's own natural parents is an improper one, or that, being deserted, such child has no home or means of livelihood other than that provided by the Guardians of the Union.'

A copy of the Resolution was transmitted to every Board of Guardians in England and Wales, with a request for support, which has been largely given; and a great number of Boards have memorialised Government in its favour. The promised Industrial Schools Bill will, it is hoped, afford opportunity for embodying an effective response to this appeal in the legislation of 1889. 'We may be told,' says the *Western Daily Press*,[1] commenting on a very similar resolution passed by the Bristol Guardians, 'what is now sought is the extension of the powers of the State, and the lessening of the responsibility of the individual. To some extent this is true, but the confession may be made with composure. Public interest must have the first claim, and the welfare of children ought not to be sacrificed to a theory which has been responsible for countless social failures. Upon the other hand, it may be contended that this new claim will make parental responsibility more real. It will have to be tested by a definite standard, and it will be only in the cases of failure to reach this standard that the State will intervene to take away powers unworthily exercised.'

The expediency of taking all children who are evilly treated by reckless or vicious parents under State Guardianship, is open at the least to grave doubt. It would free the self-indulgent at the cost of the self-controlled, and,

[1] Oct. 27th, 1888.

worse still for the children, would put a premium upon their ill-treatment. The most righteous course seems to be, while giving all possible encouragement to parents to do well, to maintain as closely as possible the balance between parental rights and parental duties; and when the latter are neglected with injury to the child and harm to the State, for the State to take her defenceless little citizens into her keeping, and by reclaiming their cost from the parent, let the burden rest where by Nature's law it should lie. The knowledge that such would be the consequence of cruelty and neglect would in many cases prevent the offence.

But the law must be amended to bring this to pass. Existing legislation frequently proves a mere fiction, while parental rights are so fenced round with prejudice and antique prestige, that it is not only often impossible to obtain adequate punishment for torture inflicted by fathers and mothers on their miserable offspring, but even to rescue these from their cruel grasp. Parental desertion may therefore become a blessing to the child, who then passes under the entire control of the State.

With legislation in prospect, it is worth while to consider the plan pursued in Scotland with such children, which Mr. Henley thus describes: 'The parochial authorities in some cases undertake the responsibility and care of children, in order to rescue them from profligate persons or evil associations. These children are the "separated" class. Their parents may be inmates of the poorhouse, or maintaining themselves; in either case the children are removed (with their consent) and boarded-out far away from evil influences, so as to have an opportunity of starting a new life. Illegitimate children who come into the poorhouse with the mother are sometimes, when there is more than one child, separated from her by her own consent and boarded-out. An able-bodied woman is supposed to maintain herself and one child, but when there are more than one the parish perhaps retains the burden of the children should the mother subsequently discharge herself. It is open to argument whether it is politic to separate

children from parents to enable profligate persons to pursue a career of vice unburthened with their offspring, which are maintained by the harder working portion of the community. Of the advantage to the children there can be no question'[1]—nor probably of that to the ratepayer; and it must be admitted that ratepayers have their rights as well as paupers. Happily, however, these, if we take a sufficiently clear and long-sighted view, will be seen to harmonise perfectly, since the best possible form of relief to the pauper is that which will most speedily raise him above dependence on the ratepayer.

To those who object that thus to help the lower class is to sacrifice to it the higher, *i.e.* the more provident, better educated, industrious, law-abiding, and therefore most valuable class, we answer that it is always the highest who must make the sacrifice of forethought, self-denial, and exertion for others, and that by these sacrifices, and these alone, can they claim superiority. A waiting philanthropy, too critical about the result of its efforts, reminds us of Cherbuliez's philosophic Sir John Almond. He waited to rescue a drowning sailor, till he had ascertained his life was worth the saving. On being assured he was the mainstay of a large family, he dived successfully and brought him to shore; but it was his dead, not his living body he rescued, as during the inquiries the man had drowned. This was reasoning philanthropy with a vengeance!

Boarding-out within the Union is often so closely allied in fact as well as name with ordinary out-relief that it finds its most appropriate place in this chapter. It was, as we have seen, within the Union that the plan first took an organised form, the various instances already described as in action before the Order of 1870 was issued being necessarily of that character. In the method formulated by the Leominster Guardians and the Eton Board (except that it does not include voluntary aid in supervision), in the committee formed by Mrs. Archer still quietly and successfully working on its original lines, and in the scheme set forth in Colonel Grant's *Practical Guide*, we have useful and vary-

[1] *Report on the Boarding-out of Pauper Children in Scotland.*

ing independent models by which to regulate this department of the system. In very many Unions it has been long in operation, but, like the proverbial well-governed country, without a history—and for the same reason. Valuable practical information is, however, to be obtained from many of these, among which Chertsey may be particularly mentioned.

The class of children eligible for boarding-out within the Union is the same as under the Order of 1870, except that it includes infants, there being no limitation of age —a restriction which has probably much diminished the number of children placed-out under it. The regulations are in most respects identical, but with the one important difference, that the children, being under the care of the Guardians and their officers, are not severed from pauper conditions. If, however, these discharge their respective duties kindly, circumspectly, and thoroughly, their wards are immeasurably better off than if left in the pauper School.

'The first act,' says Colonel Grant, 'is the appointment of a boarding-out committee [of the Guardians], which should be sufficiently numerous,—in large Unions not less than ten or twelve members—as it is very desirable that there should be a member of the committee resident in every parish in which the greater number of children are likely to be placed-out; to which should be entrusted the whole arrangements connected with boarding-out the pauper children, with full powers—subject to certain conditions—to carry the same into effect.'[1] Among his further recommendations, almost the same with those of Mr. Henley though many of them were drawn up and acted upon before the publication of Mr. Henley's Report, he advises that children should be boarded-out as young as possible. He lays great stress upon obtaining full knowledge of the character and position of persons who apply for them, and urges 'those working the system not to be in a hurry to get their children out, but to weigh well the merits of each

[1] *A Practical Guide to the Boarding-out System.* It embodies Colonel Grant's experience in establishing and conducting the plan at Bath.

applicant before entrusting a child to their care,' citing Mr. Herford's successful example at Chorlton in support of his admonition. Colonel Grant held that having selected a thoroughly good foster-parent, moderate supervision was best, but with an unsatisfactory foster-parent no amount of supervision would secure the child's welfare. In order to discover the right people, he advises that the initial step of the Committee 'should be to write to the clergy and other ministers of the several parishes comprising the Union, requesting them, in conjunction with the district visitors, to make the system known among the cottagers,' a method which seems to us safer than a common one of advertising for foster-parents.

A sufficient outfit of good quality can be supplied, Colonel Grant states, for £2 if made in the workhouse; and he points out the importance now generally felt of avoiding any resemblance to a uniform, by the selection of different materials and colours. 6s. 6d. a quarter to keep up the stock of clothing, and 3s. a week for maintenance, together with school fees and medical attendance if required, were the terms paid at Bath, and admirable homes were secured. We draw attention to those payments, as we observe a general disposition to exceed them. If the cost of Boarding-out oversteps that of maintenance in the workhouse, the extension of the plan will undoubtedly be retarded; while the children placed-out may be unduly raised above their natural position.

The importance of efficient and sufficient supervision is dwelt on in the *Guide*. The appointed inspection by the parish officers may be relied upon to some extent. The character and amount of supervision must, the author remarks, vary in different cases. In some it must be closer than in others, but prying curiosity may very naturally be resented; and inspection should, wherever possible, take the character of a friendly visit. A workhouse child may at first put its foster-parents' patience to a severe trial, and a little kindly advice and encouragement may be needed to tide over the time while the inclination is strong to give it up before it has made its way into the heart of its foster-parent. 'This personal, kindly individual attention must be supplied by voluntary

effort.' It should be given, the author says, by each member of the [Guardians] Boarding-out Committee to the children placed in his own parish, and should be supplemented by ladies. Although instancing the Committee of ladies who co-operated with Mr. Herford as admirable for towns, where, he thought, 'more frequent and careful supervision is probably required than for children in country homes,' Colonel Grant was of opinion that this method was not applicable in country Unions, such as Bath, including as it does a very large rural area. There, he believed, the help of ladies would be most available if given individually by members of the family of those Guardians who constituted the Boarding-out Committee. In Mrs. Grant he found indeed a devoted and able colleague, and other ladies in the Union gave valuable assistance. But it is possible that the decline of Boarding-out at Bath (attributed to an alleged diminution almost reaching extinction of the eligible class difficult to comprehend) may be in part due to the absence of a voluntary Committee perennially recruited, and resolved not to let the good work drop when the originator of the scheme retires from the Board. The supervision of ladies Colonel Grant puts forward as 'a most important adjunct to the working of the system. . . . But,' he says, 'do not make too frequent visits, or you will be assailed with every little trouble that occurs. It would be as bad as living next door to your medical man, whose presence is then thought indispensable in every trifling ailment. Let the little troubles adjust themselves. You will be sure to hear of anything serious, or to discover it by moderately frequent visits.'

Colonel Grant's *Guide* preceded by several years the 'General Order as to Out-door relief within Unions—orphans and deserted children,' which was issued in 1877, and is commonly known as the 'In-Order,' to distinguish it from that of 1870. As, like that, it is under revision, we will not enumerate its provisions, but it is by these that the instance of urban Boarding-out we will now describe is regulated.

Boarding-out in large town Unions presents naturally different features from that in rural districts, and has its comparative advantages and disadvantages. As an example

of good administration and successful results, we speak of it as it exists at Leeds—taking our information chiefly as epitomised in the 9th *Leaflet* of the Association for the Advancement of Boarding-out. We should, however, mention that the first effort to rescue the Leeds children from workhouse life was made by a local society of ladies in 1876. Two or three years later the Leeds Board of Guardians themselves took the matter up. Dissatisfied with their schools, where ophthalmia and other evils which arise where children are massed together prevailed, they appointed a committee of their body to investigate different methods of education for the class in question. These gentlemen visited the pauper school at Swinton in Lancashire, and that for St. Pancras at Leavesden in Hertfordshire, as favourable specimens of the 'barracks' system; the Leeds Cottage Homes at Headingley, those for little boys at Farningham, and for girls at Addlestone, as examples of division into groups; and inspected the children boarded-out from Edinburgh and Glasgow. They reported in favour of Boarding-out and Cottage Homes, but circumstances making the adoption of the latter system undesirable at the time, it was decided to try boarding-out.

After a year's trial, an elaborate and most instructive Report by the Boarding-out Committee of the Leeds Guardians, showing the method pursued to obtain trustworthy homes and secure efficient supervision, pronounced the results to be highly satisfactory so far; and Cottage Homes have never been resorted to. The applications for children had exceeded by nearly three times the number to be provided for, so that there was ample opportunity for selecting good ones. Eighty-six children were actually boarded-out, but several of these had been speedily taken off the rates by relatives (an invariable experience in beginning the system, but one demanding, for the sake of the children's welfare, great caution in yielding to such claims), and a few were adopted by their foster-parents. Some excessively delicate children were boarded-out in the country. The total cost of those supported by the rates was found to average about 5s. a week per head.

The payment has recently been lessened to 4s. 7d., in consequence of the greatly reduced cost of food and other necessaries. To that payment, however, is to be added a share of the salary of the officer of the Board (also School Attendance officer), who inspects the children and pays the foster-parents. The Guardians also visit the homes occasionally themselves, one or more always examining a proposed home before it is accepted, thus performing part of the duties fulfilled by the Certified Committee under the Order of 1870.

At the date of the last Report, 186 had been boarded-out, of whom 118 so remained. Twenty-three had been reclaimed by relatives, many of them soon after they were placed out. Two had been returned to the workhouse. Two had turned out badly. Only one had died, although Leeds boards out from infancy, when the chance of death is highest. Forty, having passed the age of 14, were in situations earning their own living, in nearly all cases continuing to dwell with their foster-parents.

'We have not,' the Boarding-out Committee state, 'experienced any difficulty in finding situations for our boarded-out children, either boys or girls, when they have attained working age. When we have ceased to pay the fees, their foster-parents find situations for them as though they were their own children, and they become absorbed into the general working-class population, and we have no more trouble with them.'[1]

An appendix gives answers from the head-masters and mistresses of nine public elementary schools, which the children attend, to inquiries concerning their appearance, behaviour, and progress issued by order of the Leeds Board. These answers are evidently written in a kindly spirit, but also with candour. Some of the children show the faults of the pauper class, and also show themselves amenable to the favourable influences of ordinary life in good homes; but a large proportion seem in no way distinguishable from those of our respectable working classes.

[1] *Leeds Union Orphan and Deserted Children. Report of the Boarding-out Committee.* March 24, 1887.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Information to nearly the end of 1888 from Mr. Humble, the indefatigable Chairman of the Boarding-out Committee, gives the number placed out up to that time as 190, among whom there had been a second death. It is remarkable that neither occurred among the infants. These have, in every respect, Mr. Humble considers, done best of all the children, growing up in their foster-homes unconscious that they are not the offspring of those they have always known as parents.

In the Report for 1887 a Table is given of the comparative cost of various methods of bringing up a pauper child, as follows:

	Per Week.	
	s.	*d.*
Leeds—Previous to boarding-out	7	0
Leeds—Children not boarded-out who now attend the public Elementary Schools	5	2
Leeds—Boarded-out children	4	7
Midland Counties Unions—Cottage Homes . .	7	6
Midland Counties Unions—Industrial Training Schools	7	4
Several Lancashire Unions—Industrial Schools	5s. 2d. to 6	3
Five Metropolitan Unions—Cottage Homes and Industrial Schools	5s. 6d. to 10	6

The above sums do not include cost of buildings, repayment of loans, etc., which must be added in every case except that of Boarding-out. At Leeds, ten years ago, it amounted to 2s. 10d. per head per week, making the cost of each child in the workhouse school 9s. 10d.

It is well when information derived from workers can be checked by an outside observer, especially if that observer is peculiarly fitted to arrive at a correct judgment of the work he criticises. We have before us a Report by Mr. J. R. Mozley, Inspector of Poor Law Schools, on the children boarded-out in the Leeds Union, giving his impression derived from informal visits paid to their homes from time to time during a period of twelve months. His object, he states, was to estimate results, and to do so he thought it more important to assure himself of the character and position of the foster-parents than merely to see the children. 'One is apt,' he remarks, 'to find the children

too shy for any real information to be obtainable from them; but the foster-parent, even at a single visit, is sure to let fall something which will show how he or she regards the child.'[1] He was satisfied that 'in a distinct majority of cases the relationship desired was really established.' Mr. Mozley seems to think it unreasonable to suppose that the foster-child can occupy precisely the position of a real one, but he is sure that in that majority 'the feeling of the foster-parent is one of affectionate interest, and not the mere fulfilment of a formal duty.'

In seeking results as testified by the after conduct of the children, Mr. Mozley limited his inquiries to a hundred and fifty-one, whose boarding-out began not later than the end of 1884, and considered first the cases of thirty-one placed out with foster-parents after reaching their tenth year. This is always a severe test, as the success of the system is, roughly speaking, in proportion to the early age at which children are placed out. Yet Mr. Mozley, after carefully analysing the list, says—'The result is, I think, on the whole a very fair one. Still the imperfections in it are sufficient to account for and justify the resolution of the Guardians not to board-out for the first time any more children so old as this.'

The 130 children sent to foster-homes when *under* ten years old, Mr. Mozley divides into six classes for more thorough examination, and we think the results given may be considered typical of the system when carefully administered, except that eleven children returned to the workhouse are a somewhat large proportion. Two, however, went back in consequence of their homes being broken up by the death of one foster-parent and the serious illness of another; and in the latter case the child was shortly afterwards sent to service and there remains. Of two others of the eleven, the foster-parents were to blame; most of the remaining seven 'were children whose natural defects needed more patience and care in their management than ordinary foster-parents have at their command'—the class

[1] *Report to the Secretary of the Local Government Board on the Children Boarded-out within the Limits of the Leeds Union.* Leeds: Whitehead & Son, 1888.

for whom the small Homes have been created in Australia to prepare them for genuine boarding-out. Had these children been under the care of a voluntary Committee operating over a large area, and having a variety of homes to choose from, the qualities and means for special treatment, experience shows us, would probably have been found. But this detailed application of the plan is only possible where the earnest enthusiasm shown by the Leeds Guardians is combined with the leisure of voluntary workers.

The deaths are recorded of two of the 120 children (the only ones we believe among the whole number boarded-out since the plan was adopted at Leeds), one from heart disease and the other from an accident. In the latter instance the neighbours showed their affection for the child by erecting a monument to his memory. After giving many satisfactory particulars of the remainder, Mr. Mozley says:

'On the whole, the boarding-out of the 120 children with whom I am now dealing must be considered very successful. The large number of cases (74) in which the child has never changed its home is notable. So, too, is the considerable proportion of cases in which the foster-child preserves a tie of affection with the foster-parents. . . . So, too, is the rarity, so far as my information goes, of positive unkindness on the part of the foster-parent. I do not mean that I have entered in this Report every case of this kind that I have heard of, or that there may not be (as undoubtedly there will be) cases that escape notice; but of cruel treatment I have come across no instance. More common faults may be expected to be,—overworking the child, and stinginess in failing to supply it with proper food, or with clothing; but I do not know of more than one instance of each of these three faults. In two of the three cases the child was taken away from the foster-parent.' After referring to the bad habits some of these poor children bring with them, he adds, 'Some foster-parents do show extraordinary patience. One of them told me that the elder of two girls boarded-out with her had stolen £4 in one week after her arrival. This sum was irrecoverably wasted; and both the girls were thievish and lying. Yet

the foster-parent has kept these two girls for over seven years, and the elder is now in good employment.'

A very simple method was described a few years ago by Miss Mason (the present Inspector of Boarded-out children under the Local Government Board), by which voluntary supervision may be added to that of the parish officers, for children boarded-out within their union.[1] She was asked, she stated, by the Guardians of her own union, to look after these children, and to put each under the care of a lady who should report if anything were the matter to the Chairman of the Guardians' Boarding-out Committee, or to herself, and she was to report every six months to the Guardians. The Boards of other unions in the county had, she said, asked her to overlook their children in like manner, and the plan, from Miss Mason's account, had worked satisfactorily.

We have referred with some particularity to these examples of Boarding-out within the union, both urban and rural, for two reasons. Though the numbers yet dealt with are but small, adoption of the plan is rapidly increasing, while the new Orders are expected to extend the classes eligible for it; and if Guardians avail themselves of that extension, Boarding-out will become a large and certainly a very important department of their work.

Our second motive has a less satisfactory source. We have been warned by a high authority that among the children returned as under the operation of the In-Order, probably a large number are practically receiving out-relief much as it has been administered since the days of Queen Elizabeth. Their welfare is a matter of chance dependent on the character and disposition of the persons with whom they live. Rumours of hardship and even cruelty inflicted upon children of this class in remote country places are from time to time afloat, with, we have grounds to fear, sufficient reason; and we desire to call attention to the facility of abuse to which they are exposed, and to raise inquiry concerning their actual condition.

[1] *Sessional Proceedings of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science.*

In addition to such children nominally protected by the In-Order, but whose well-being we seriously doubt, there are, we learn from the latest Return, '10,699 Orphans or other children [we conclude deserteds] relieved without their parents.'[1] Now the In-Order is absolute, that for all children *placed in homes* by the Guardians, its provisions shall take effect. We must conclude, therefore, that the above number are not placed out by the Guardians, but, 'are living with relatives or friends, and to whom outdoor-relief may be granted,'[2] and can hardly be supposed to be better off than those we have spoken of as only nominally under the Order. We think that the condition of these also demands investigation.

It is very properly provided that children boarded-out under Certified Committees shall from time to time be inspected by an officer of the Central Department. If this be desirable for young people under the supervision of persons whose social position and disinterested motives raise them above suspicion, and whose voluntary assumption of responsibility and trouble is a guarantee of their zeal and self-devotion, how much more must it be needed for those having but a very uncertain hold on the affection of their care-takers at the best, perhaps, very unfit if not unwilling guardians. We think central inspection is at least as needful for those boarded within as without the union, and we await the revised Order in the hope that it will be provided. Our conviction, however, is strong that inspection is even more imperatively demanded by the unprotected position of the still less cared-for and more helpless class of which we have just spoken.

We would go yet further. The abolition of out-relief, its substantial reduction even, belongs to the future, but much may be done meanwhile to neutralise the evil it contains by a strict and guarded administration. A conscientious and indefatigable guardian here and there will be himself an inspector, assuring himself that the relieving officer is discharging his duty efficiently, and that the relief

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1887-88.
[2] General Order, Art. 1, note (e).

given benefits the person for whom it is intended, and not other members of the family or household. But such vigilance is rare; not many Guardians have the time to exercise it even if they had the mind. Central inspectors would be well employed in reducing the evils of out-relief to a minimum by detecting and reporting neglect or violation of the law. The children, who form more than a third of the vast army of our out-paupers, would benefit directly and largely by such strictness, while its incidental effect would certainly be to remove many from the rates, and check that conscious dependence on them in childhood which is a sure source of adult pauperism.

CHAPTER XI

CONCLUSION

'And yet we trust that somehow good
Will be the final goal of ill,
To pangs of nature, sins of will,
Defects of doubt, and taints of blood.'
A. TENNYSON.

'You must love him e'er to you
He will seem worthy of your love.'
W. WORDSWORTH.

IT remains now to estimate the worth of the different methods which we have described of training our State children, and the gauge we propose to apply is their greater or less success in attaining these three objects—(1) Of depauperising the children by enabling them to take their place on an equal footing among the well-conducted of the labouring classes; (2) of securing to them the friendly interest of persons able to afford the protection and advice needful amid the temptations and difficulties with which they will inevitably be beset after they go into the world; and (3) of affording such conditions of happiness in childhood as are consonant with justifiable expenditure from the public purse.

Considering first the schools within the workhouse, it is now generally admitted that those attached to urban workhouses fail to any practical extent to attain any of these objects. The central authority has practically caused their discontinuance in London, and Boards of Guardians have of their own accord given them up in many of the large provincial towns. But while the Metropolitan Guardians,

by compulsion, and certain others by a wise policy, place their schools far from the workhouse, this is still the exception, and a very small exception, to the rule. Urban schools, even if classed as 'Separate,' are sometimes within the workhouse enclosure. Separation of children from adults is in these cases, as we have already shown, impossible; and the evils which result are urgent and manifold.

There remains to be considered the effect of the great majority of workhouse Schools—those, namely, attached to rural workhouses, the pupils ranging in number from nine upwards, and rarely passing fifty.[1] Where the limit does not exceed that of a large family, where the officers are good, and especially where the matron is a kind and motherly woman, the evils of pauper surroundings are doubtless reduced to a minimum. One of our wisest and most benevolent Poor Law administrators, referring to such a school, has claimed for it merit at least equal to that of Boarding-out; but on the other hand, the chairman of a rural union, where Boarding-out has long been in operation, denounces such schools as 'breeding pauperism.' Again, we have heard an experienced Poor-law officer, high in the Department, express the wish that all were swept away. There seems ground to expect the fulfilment of his wish. Already more than a third in one county, Northumberland, have been closed, the children being sent to outside elementary schools, a constantly increasing practice now adopted in 324—about half—the unions of England and Wales, while others send some of their children, usually the boys, to outside schools.[2] It must be remembered that great as are the advantages of this plan, the hours out of school have still to be passed in the workhouse. There is, besides, always the danger of a permanent attachment to it as an abode, and the greater the kindness received there, the less repellent the conditions, the more will it be clung to as 'home,' and this certainly is the last association with the workhouse we should wish the young pauper to acquire.

[1] *Report of the Local Government Board*, 1887-88. In former Reports we have found the total number as low as five, and even two. [2] *Ibid.*

A really separate school, judged by the Children's Establishment at Limehouse, or on the model of that at Hartismere, or, better still, at Bridgend, may succeed to a great degree in depauperising its pupils, and making their young lives happy. The staff is usually large, and the numbers congregated small in the Separate, by comparison with the District School, though there are exceptions to the rule; as, for instance, S. Pancras Separate School at Leavesden, has nearly six hundred children, and the Ely District Schools only two. Individualisation is possible, and this leads to mutual affection between teacher and pupil, and practical effort on the part of the former, in the shape of correspondence and visits, to maintain a wholesome influence over the child in after life. Still objections, which are intensified in proportion to the denseness of the masses assembled under one roof, affect in a minor degree the smaller separate schools; and even their advantages may be lost. Limehouse was an exceptionally good example of this class, but it had a short duration in accordance with a tendency to close the smaller institution, and send the children to the larger District School, under a mistaken idea of securing economy in staff and establishment charges; or if circumstances cause the Separate School to be enlarged, its favourable conditions diminish in inverse ratio.

Among other evils, the elaborate and costly arrangements introduced into the large schools as a boon have by long experience proved absolutely hostile to one of the principal objects to be aimed at in the training of pauper children. The more the life of these young people differs from that of the work-a-day world, the more difficult do they find it to accommodate themselves to its demands when they go into it to earn their living; and an establishment where they engross the care and attention of a large staff of officers and servants cannot rightly prepare its inmates to take and hold their place among our working classes.

In regard to the physical conditions of the schools, in spite of scientific ventilation and drainage, pure and abundant water, and wholesome food, it is almost impossible to

keep ophthalmia and skin diseases at bay; while in some these evils are so prevalent that we find, for instance, at Hanwell, a department called the Ophthalmic school, created for the sufferers from this malady, just as a 'Lazaretto' school was created at Cork for the miserable victims of scrofula brought on by disregard of the simplest natural laws. In the huge English schools also it is beyond doubt that scrofulous affections fasten on the children with remarkable pertinacity and deplorable results; indeed the mere pressure of unbroken school life and long monotonous routine must conduce to lowered vitality; and thus it is found that the inmates need more sustenance, as well as much more elaborate sanitary arrangements, than children brought up under the conditions appointed by nature; just as prisoners need better food than free men to keep them in health and strength.

The low death-rate of many of our large pauper schools, cited as proof of their healthy conditions and an implied strong vitality among the children, is entirely misleading, though easily explained. Infants, in some instances, up to four years old—namely, during that period of childhood when mortality is highest—are excluded; while children of all ages known to be suffering from mortal disease are retained in the Workhouse Infirmary, and the recommendation of the Local Government Board that no child be sent to the Schools who is incapable of receiving school instruction, probably keeps away many in whom fatal disease is lurking undeclared. The schools, therefore, deal only with selected cases, and thus is explained the seeming incongruity of a low death-rate together with a low vitality; and a low vitality, with its stunted physical development and lack of energy, does not prepare the child to take its place in the world on a footing with the industrious.

In respect to our second test of success in pauper education, it must be borne in mind that it is no part of these Schools to retain hold over their pupils above sixteen, and that practically they are dismissed at fourteen, no after-home being offered them. Indeed shelter among the scenes and teachers of their childish years would bring

with it danger and disgrace. They must turn resolutely away from all early associations if they would do well in after life—a radical defect of State-guardianship when exercised through the medium of pauper schools.

Cottage Homes, as we have seen, are but Separate or District Schools in detached instead of connected buildings, and they too must close their doors for ever on the departing child. Most true, M.A.B.Y.S. and kindred Societies offer their protection and sympathy, but the very difficulty encountered in obtaining their acceptance—we are not now speaking of Boards of Guardians who still reject this valuable aid, but of the children themselves—is a measure of the difference between what is at best an artificial substitute and the watchful love born of early associations and home ties.

Do the Schools fulfil our last requirement? To the child starved and beaten by its wicked parents they undoubtedly seem a haven of refuge; and silent tears, the saddest expression of childish grief, may mark the poor victim's return to the power of its tyrants. But this proves nothing as regards the remainder. The dull faces, shrinking attitude, and tearful petition, if there is a sympathetic ear to listen,—'Please let me go home,'—characteristic of the least satisfactory schools, show how little happiness can exist there. We eagerly avow that more and more is being done to bring these young lives under influences natural to childhood; and to the superficial observer in many schools—even to the seeker below the surface in some—these efforts may appear successful. 'Our children are much brighter than they were,' writes a kind-hearted and most devoted Matron; 'and the more they are treated like children the brighter they will be.' It is the best recipe we know, but it is capable only of very limited application. The schools have been founded and developed on principles diametrically opposed to the laws of nature, and cannot be brought into conformity with them. A sure test of the children's feeling on the subject is furnished us by Boarding-out. We have known but one instance in which a boarded-out child even professed satisfaction on being told long-

continued insubordination and troublesomeness made it necessary to send him back to the workhouse, and this was probably bravâdo; for when his *peine forte et dure* was over he thankfully returned to his foster-home and gave no trouble afterwards. But many cases have come to our knowledge in which the sight of a person known or supposed to belong to its parish, and assumed to have come to carry it away, has filled a little foster-child with dread, turning it pale and sick with fear; while more adventurous ones have fled to neighbouring coverts, and (as related by Mr. Greig) in one instance spent two days and nights in the woods in order not to return till the supposed danger was past.

A striking instance to the same effect, which attracted much attention at the time, occurred a year or two ago, when a London Board of Guardians, under the influence of a scare, resolved to withdraw from a Committee all the children they had placed under its care. They were chiefly boys, and these, excepting some little ones, made off when the officers sent to reclaim them appeared in sight, and a long summer's day was spent in catching them, accomplished at last only by a ruse. Twice in the following night, which had to be passed at an inn, did the more adventurous lads try to escape; the first time, when they erroneously supposed every one else to be asleep, by the entrance door; the second by sheets tied together from their window. They had ample reasons for their unwillingness to leave their foster-parents, in the kindness they had received, their improved health, and in the general though not uniform excellence of their homes.[1] Another Board of Guardians, alarmed by reports of the ill-usage it was alleged these children had received, sent some of their members at once to inspect some of their own boarded-out in the same village, and in one or two instances, we believe,

[1] While writing, we have chanced to hear, in regard to one of the homes most objected to, how completely it fulfilled its mission to a boy from the same parish, previously a boarder in it, and who was transferred thence to the *Exmouth*. He comes to spend his holidays with his foster-parents, who treat him like a son, even paying his fare, until now, having entered a military band, he is able and proud to take this expense upon himself.

in the same home. They reported so favourably that the result was a resolution to board-out every child to whom the system could be applied.

The constraint of the Schools, the lack of satisfaction of childish tastes and affections, the absence of variety, fresh experiences and discovery, which constitute the educational atmosphere appointed by Nature, and give zest to existence, might account for their failure to bestow the happiness which is essential to the child's full development. But besides these negative conditions operating against the children's welfare, there are positive elements of suffering existing, we fear, more or less in every school—in some in spite of earnest efforts to prevent them, but in others due to neglect and indifference on the part of officers, and, may be, of guardians too. From time to time cases come before the latter, and now and then before the public, proving this only too clearly, and painfully suggesting how much may remain concealed where the sufferers have so little power of complaint. It is not difficult to imagine what must have been the suffering inflicted on several hundred children under the dominion of a superintendent, matron, and head schoolmistress, who all drank, and where the latter was so cruel that when her conduct became known, it seemed only too reasonable to trace to it the deaths of some of her victims. She was accustomed to lock up out of sight, on school committee days, those likely to complain; still nothing less than shameful negligence on the guardians' part could have kept them ignorant. Absconding from the school was frequent, and the school itself became a bye-word of bad management. Improvements in recent years have now placed it on a level in many respects with the best.

But even in schools standing high in public estimation, acts of cruelty from time to time come to light. A band-master or trades' teacher loses his temper, breaks the rule which requires every offence to be reported to the Superintendent, and punishment to be administered only with his authority, and severely beats an offending boy; or an irate hard-hearted mistress or matron sends a girl from her bed

to stand barefooted on the stone staircase. Or the ill-usage may come from the older boys 'dressed in a little brief authority,' and left to exercise it unsupervised. Even if the superior officers are all that can be desired, it is impossible for them to know or find out everything that is going on among their subordinates and the lower stratum of children; and it is equally impossible for Guardians, in periodical visits which may be prepared for, to discover much of what is happening beneath the surface. And if impossible for Guardians bent on doing their duty, what likelihood is there of wrong being detected and abuses redressed if the Guardians look upon their visit as a country holiday and jollification, when eating, drinking, and even in some cases card-playing occupy so much of their time as to leave only enough to go through the books in the most perfunctory manner, and none for inspection of the children? Such Guardians are now, it may be hoped, the rare exception, but they still exist, and ratepayers who by their election entrust them with the fate of these young creatures —still more those who abstain from a public duty by not voting at all—incur a terrible responsibility.

It is clear then, we think, that pauper Schools do not fulfil our third condition. Their cost we have shown to be a heavy burden on the ratepayer. If they fail to fulfil their purpose that burden is not only heavy but useless.

We must point out, too, that, so far as these schools do not depauperise the children brought up in them, the cost of the failures must be added to the already enormous sums they have swallowed up. What that cost is we may learn from Mr. Chadwick. 'Every able-bodied pauper,' he calculates, 'who enters on life without the will or the power to earn a living, must cost the community, at the lowest estimate, £400, at the rate of £10 a year, for the forty years which the Insurance Tables give as the probable duration of his life from the Adolescent Stage. The value of his wages for the same period would, at the average rate of £30 a year, be £1200. Thus, between the productive labourer and one of the class for whom Mr. Chadwick revives

the expressive old English word of "wastrels," there is a difference of £1600. If the pauper turns vagrant, he will levy contributions in a different manner, but to a still greater extent. If he turns thief, there is no assigning their limit.'[1] Under every aspect, therefore, we must regard Pauper schools as generally unsuccessful.

Industrial Certified Homes are very valuable, and attain a large measure of success in the objects we deem essential, though it must not be forgotten that they deal mainly with selected cases, and that they depend for their very existence on the exceptional benevolence and capacity of individuals, at whose death they are liable to collapse. Happily, Guardians are more and more awakening to their value, and showing their appreciation of voluntary co-operation by utilising them unceasingly, while, at the same time, the Homes are multiplying and receiving a more varied class of children. We earnestly hope their increased scope will include boys, for whom only two or three yet exist. There are many lads delicate in constitution and sensitive in character, for whom the individual affectionate treatment of a Home is as much needed as it is for girls. For yet another class, those slow of intellect or hardened in heart by ill-treatment, nothing short of home influence is of any avail—though that, happily, as the Aubert Park Home shows, has vital power.

In the Norwich Homes we find a plan devised by enlightened Guardians, by which the difficult problem of planting-out workhouse boys among the labouring population and gradually making them independent, was solved. It applied, however, to a portion only, the temporary children being — wisely, no doubt — excluded from its operation; but, so far as it went, it ranked in success, as regarded the boys, with certified Homes, and probably for the same reason—a large infusion, namely, of the voluntary element. With the girls, the plan, it is said, was less successful. For them it took the form, we believe, rather

[1] *Quarterly Review*, October 1861.

of a small pauper school than a Home, though entirely removed from the workhouse.

Of emigration there is, we believe, but one opinion as to its excellence. When conducted with due care, and applied to suitable children, those morally and physically promising, yet so circumstanced at home as to make a fresh start, under conditions impossible in the old country, it is their best hope of success in life. That success, however, we hold, is likely to be diminished rather than increased by previous residence in a pauper school, and we believe the best preparation to secure it will be found in Boarding-out, or the Emigration Homes. Remembering the excess of females over males in our population, we would urge that, instead of increasing this disparity, we should strive to redress the balance by sending out more girls than boys, especially as in most of our colonies there is a deficiency of women. Among our female children of the State there is a class for whom the wider elbow-room, the less strongly marked contrasts of wealth and poverty, and less exigent forms of domestic service, promise a happy future, which sad experience shows does not await them here. Girls with good hearts but rough tempers, strong limbs but clumsy ways; raw material thrust aside here by more cultivated competitors, but capable of becoming valuable where every human being has room for development.

In many respects apprenticeship to manufacturers, under the conditions of the experiments we have described, seems to have fulfilled our tests of success. But more recent attempts have proved less satisfactory, and the experience of late years shows that under the present limitation of the hours of children's work in factories, their labour will not wholly remunerate employers, rendering a subsidy from Guardians necessary, and this has been pronounced illegal. Indeed the changed and, we hold, improved tone of public feeling with reference to child labour tends more and more to render any return to the old system of pauper apprenticeship impossible. And it yet remains to be seen how

this can best be replaced, and the children trained in bread-winning handicraft.

Apprenticeship to smack-owners known to take a kindly interest in their boys, and to colliery work, if the lads are indentured to carefully selected working men, individualises them and brings them within the range of family influences, and appears to afford a desirable opening for the strong and enterprising.

We have now to summarise the facts we have laid before our readers in regard to the Boarding-out system, and to apply to it our tests. It has been pursued long enough and under sufficiently varied circumstances to reveal its excellences, and to enable us to estimate how far any defects disclosed are capable of removal or amendment. In Ireland it has turned to noble account the best feelings of her people. In Scotland its success is undisputed, and is accompanied by a marked diminution in pauperism with an increasing population. It is generally acknowledged that France, in spite of her social troubles, has been singularly free from that terrible taint of pauperism under which more tranquilly prosperous neighbours have groaned and suffered; and in France we find that placing the State children in families has been the custom from time immemorial. In Germany independent philanthropists who have made the salvation of destitute children their special mission, elevate the influence of domestic life above every other agency which can be brought to bear for their reclamation. Indeed, in every European country there is evidence that from early ages it suggested itself as the natural method for providing for children without parents. The artificial orphanage, whose foundation was frequently the act of religious enthusiasm, and the heaping of destitute children in large institutions (an expedient of official necessity), were resorted to as a means of disposing of numbers allowed to accumulate unduly, and experience has shown how evil inherent in the plan has surely developed, and been conquered only by breaking up the mass. We have already shown that a comparison of the cost

of the different systems leaves a very large balance in favour of Boarding-out, and though this should not be the first consideration, it is an argument that must be allowed its full value.

But the most conclusive evidence in favour of Boarding-out is that it has been deliberately adopted, after searching inquiry, both in our Colonies and the United States, not only as a humane policy, but as a distinct check on pauperism and crime. In those great Continents it has received a development and impetus hitherto lacking here, yet largely due to loyalty to the old English traditions of hearth and home. Our kinsfolk in the Colonies, and may we not add too our American cousins, need have little fear that their splendid future will be darkened by the shadow of a large pauper caste.

Boarding-out is essentially democratic, in the best sense of that word, knitting together all ranks in one common interest and work. That the foster-parents should not be out of pocket by their acceptance of an orphan is, we are persuaded, all that should be aimed at in apportioning their remuneration. Food, clothing, and shelter may be paid for by the State; but the love, sympathy, and self-devotion equally essential to a child's welfare cannot be bought, and must be the far more precious contribution of the foster-parent; and in this the giver and the receiver are equally blessed. That there are women among the poor willing to bestow the rich gifts of affection on these desolate children is abundantly proved, nor is this motherly solicitude limited to the married. 'Our local committee,' says the Rev. E. W. Holmes, 'placed a young child in the charge of an unmarried woman, who seemed to think she would like to try the experiment. It had not been under her care a month when symptoms of lung disease became apparent. I suggested to her that the child might at once be changed for another before this little girl should have become a confirmed invalid on her hands. "What," said she looking up into my face with surprise, "let Daisy go back to die in a workhouse? No, indeed. God has given her to me as my child, and whatever the result of her illness, I will try to

take care of her now.'"[1] So well was her resolve fulfilled that the little creature, now a school girl, is in fair health and will, it is expected, be able to support herself when the proper time comes.

We have rarely been more touched than by the scene which presented itself in the modest home of another little orphan girl, the abode of two old maids. They doated on her, and she had become to them the light of their house. This case, dating now from many years ago, peculiarly illustrates the beneficial working of the plan. An illegitimate child, the little thing, on her mother's death, was about to be sent to the workhouse, when a lady in the neighbourhood obtained permission to place her in a cottage, the Board of Guardians allowing outdoor relief. An aunt in service at a distance attended the funeral; and the child's protector appealed to her to contribute to her maintenance. Thankful that the little one should be saved from the workhouse, she gladly agreed to give a shilling weekly, a large sum for her, and sent it not only cheerfully, but with expressions of the warmest gratitude to the benevolent suggester of the plan. She became deeply interested in her niece's welfare, with whom a natural and wholesome connection was maintained; whereas, if the girl had gone to the workhouse, her relation would probably have felt ashamed of, or even forgotten her. She had instead the gratification of knowing that, after a happy childhood, her niece entered respectable service, and a few years afterwards married a well-to-do artisan.

It is hardly necessary to recapitulate the physical advantages to the children under the Boarding-out system, but we must mention here a striking instance of recognition of them, in that the London Foundling Hospital boards-out its wards from about two months to five years old. They are placed in the families of labourers or mechanics in the Home counties, each district being under the supervision of a medical man and his wife. The secretary informs us that the children thrive, and that strong feelings

[1] *Boarding-out, an Aid in the Repression of Crime*, by Edward M. Holmes, LL.B. Oxford. Upstone & Doe, 1884.

of affection spring up between them and their foster-parents; they often spend their holidays in their foster-homes, and seem to look upon them as their natural resort. The mortality is about 5 per cent, the average rate (under five years old) for all England being 26, in her crowded towns reaching 36, but falling in some country districts to 18.[1]

On the question of economy we are able to speak still more decisively than when the first edition of this book was published. The costliness of district schools has far exceeded what was first anticipated, a fact apparently not yet generally recognised by Guardians, or if recognised, regarded seemingly as inevitable—one of those evils inherent in the nature of things. We are of the same opinion. Given an institution in which children are crowded together, the expedients necessary to counteract the evils created in this battle with nature must be costly; and we may add, often as futile as costly. Calculating the number of children now receiving indoor relief, who under the conditions of the Boarding-out Order might be transferred to foster-homes, at 35,000—a moderate estimate—we see how large a saving would be effected.

The average reduction of cost in regard to children in the Metropolis and great provincial centres of population—those namely now dealt with in large schools, would probably be to half the present expenditure, the most striking diminution occurring in the Metropolis. Boarding-out within the union, to which children are generally transferred from their workhouse, does not usually effect so large an economy, but it is one more difficult to calculate, because the expenditure for adult and juvenile inmates is not separately stated. If, however, the children be charged with their share of the workhouse staff and structural expenses, as they should be to obtain a fair ground of comparison, there will certainly be a saving to the ratepayers by boarding them out, but it will vary according to the amount of that share. Any method by which a reduction in local expenditure can be made is becoming a matter of grave importance, and the increase in the education rate might

[1] *Vital Statistics*, by William Farr, 1885. London.

well be balanced by re-adjustment in other directions, particularly in the one just specified, as the employment of the rates to secure adequate school accommodation has removed what might have been a serious obstacle to the full development of Boarding-out.[1]

The question has arisen, and is gaining more and more attention among us, whether it is wise to limit boarding-out to the orphaned and deserted. Many besides these remain year in year out in the Pauper school, because their parents continue to be dependent on the rates. The Paddington Guardians have applied to the Local Government Board for permission to board out the children of able-bodied paupers, when these have been a full year in the workhouse, and the Cork Guardians ask for still greater powers. If, they urge, these little paupers are not to remain paupers always, they must see something better than the thriftlessness and disorder of adult pauperism, or the rigid mechanism of the Schools; while, in the rare cases of undeserved pauperism, boarding-out is obviously more merciful, not only to the child, but, for its sake, to the parent also. In the colonies, this course is attended sometimes by the serious difficulty of interference by dissolute parents, and sometimes by others incapacitated for the care of their children by less unworthy causes, a difficulty which may be expected to occur in England too. If it does, we must ask our Scottish neighbours on the one hand, and our Australian exemplars on the other, how it may be wisely met.

Experience has now shown that cases of ill-treatment among boarded-out children are extremely rare, and usually soon detected, though instances are alleged of children, even when closely questioned, denying unkind treatment subsequently ascertained to have occurred. Systematic and continued cruelty is virtually impossible with the checks of private and public inspection, neighbourly observation, and our Argus-eyed and ubiquitous press. We speak now of the children boarded-out under the care of Certified Committees; those boarded-out within the union

[1] Appendix II.

are under the direct control of the Guardians and are supervised by their officer. But zealous and kind-hearted as he may be, his duty must be a matter of more or less routine, and the time of his visits may usually be calculated. Moreover, a man, however thoughtful for the children's welfare, does not possess the knowledge of their wants and difficulties which comes almost intuitively to a woman; and to supplement, therefore, official authority by the friendly watchfulness which ladies residing within easy reach of the orphans' homes can exercise, seems to us the keystone of the system. So far as we know, their co-operation has been obtained wherever the plan is most successful.

'Whenever we try to plan out for the benefit of others what is contrary to the order of nature, just so far we make a mistake,' remarks Miss Schuyler, and we do not think that any one will venture to dispute that home life is the natural order for children. The Prince Consort, when addressing the Conference on National Education in 1857, referred in touching words to the share taken by the poor man's children in the support and care of his household: 'The daughters especially,' he said, 'are the handmaids of the house, the assistants of the mother, the nurses of the younger children, the aged, and the sick.' But how can girls shut up in a district school learn or even know of these duties, or gain the 'sense that handles daily life'?

Treating the same subject, Mary Carpenter has remarked, 'A real good home is infinitely better than any school for the education of girls—even a second-rate or a third-rate one is preferable. There her true nature is developed, and unless she is thus prepared to fill its duties well in after life, all other teaching is comparatively useless.'[1]

A strong objection made to the Boarding-out scheme, when it was first started, viz. the insufficiency of good foster-homes, has been found by long experience to be groundless. All who are intimately acquainted with our humbler brethren (whose generosity in giving, in proportion to their means, far exceeds that of the wealthier classes) are aware

[1] *Social Science Transactions*, 1862.

that it is no unusual occurrence for a child who loses its parents, to be spontaneously received into another family; and the kindly feeling which prompts adoption often exists where the scantiness of the family income bars its indulgence. In such cases, character and other circumstances being suitable, payment covering the cost of the child removes the obstacle. Practically the supply of good homes far exceeds the demand, although but a small portion of the areas desirable for boarding-out have yet been touched. There are doubtless some neighbourhoods less fit than others, as, for instance, certain mining and manufacturing districts, where the conditions are not favourable to healthy growth; and perhaps very sparsely inhabited localities, where supervision is difficult, are even less fit. Boarding-out within the union necessarily restricts the choice of homes to its limits, possibly a manufacturing town or other presumably unfavourable district. But we have the testimony of Guardians, notably at Leeds and at Chorlton, that the children are much brighter and happier in their urban foster-homes than in the palatial school, even when this is in the country; and the large proportion of those gone off the rates at Leeds (we believe also at Chorlton), who are creditable citizens, proves that town life is not necessarily injurious either morally or physically; and it is, it must be remembered, the unavoidable lot of thousands of children of ratepayers, who are supporting the dependent class. Nevertheless the miserable constitutions many of the latter inherit make it important to give them all the help country life can bestow, and boarding-out within the union must sometimes fail in this respect.

We must not, however, be supposed to assume that *because* the foster-home is in the country, therefore the moral surroundings will be free from risk of contamination. No one acquainted with our rural poor can, unfortunately, deny the dark shadow of vice and drunkenness sometimes to be found among the fairest surroundings. But it is for the Certified Committees to avoid these evils by a judicious choice of homes. In face of the rapid increase of our town population, some counterbalance, however slight, is

valuable, and there is this merit in the plan which transfers the children of our great cities to the country.

To the objection that agricultural pursuits no longer offer good openings for boys, we answer, that they are not exclusively limited to agriculture because they are brought up in the country. Some become gentlemen's servants, etc., and some emigrate, while the Certified Committees, after ascertaining what centres of population attract the lads, can open relations in such places for them with the Y.M.F.S. and similar organisations. Nor do we believe that the present depression of agricultural interests can remain a permanent condition for a laborious and enterprising people.

The Letter of Mr. Peel which accompanied the Boarding-out Order of 1870 mentioned a population of fifteen thousand as a limit to the size of villages or towns in which children should be placed. There are numerous little country towns falling far short of this number of inhabitants which afford admirable homes, and where industries exist giving good opportunities for getting boys out to work. Such localities, as an alternative to purely agricultural districts, are extremely desirable for them as combining good air, abundant supervision, and the prospect of a successful launch into life, while the disadvantages of a large centre of population are absent.

A danger besets Boarding-out, as we have seen, in our colonies as well as here, where those unacquainted with its working would least expect to find one. It is the danger of over-interest on the part of the Committee (to which those having very few children under their care are probably most prone), and over-petting by the foster-parents. In no way should the foster-child discover a difference between itself and the child of the house, or, if there be no child of the house, between itself and its other child-companions. Foolish indulgence, overlooking its faults, or making it conspicuous, are sure to create future difficulties in its training. Colonel Grant detected this danger, and guarded against it. 'It would not be fair,' he said, 'to make special pets of these children, or to single them out for particular notice and regard. . . . They should not be put

above the other children of the family. . . . Whilst ascertaining that the foster-child is well treated and cared for, we should show an interest in the other children, and try and treat them all alike.'[1] And thus, when inviting to entertainments in his garden the little orphans he had rescued from the workhouse, their foster-brothers and sisters were always asked too.

No general and authentic Returns of the results of Boarding-out in England are issued. Some of the more important Committees include them in Reports which they put forth from time to time; but we think the stage in the development of the plan has arrived when the Central Department should obtain from its administrators the information which would enable it to lay such results in a tabulated form before the public. These will be found to be by no means uniform, and great improvements might be effected by the less successful Committees being thus enabled to profit by the experience of others. The public, too, would gain confidence in work of which the outcome was thus unreservedly submitted to it.

Increasing faith in the healthful influences of family life reveals itself in many directions and under conditions where we were hardly prepared to meet with it. The late Dr. Howe, the distinguished American physician whose development of the mental powers of the deaf mute, Laura Bridgeman, won world-wide fame, after many years' experience came to regard the assemblage in institutions of any class of sufferers as an evil which must be modified by every means in our power, and if possible altogether avoided. 'I not only organised' (he said at a public meeting) 'the first institution for the blind in the United States . . . but laboured with more zeal than knowledge to induce people to found others. . . . I accept my full share of condemnation when I say that grave errors were incorporated into the very organic principles of our institutions for the blind which make them already too much like asylums, which threaten to cause real asylums to grow out of them, and to engender other evils. All great establishments in the nature of

[1] *A Practical Guide to the Boarding-out System.*

Boarding schools; where the sexes must be separated; where there must be boarding in common and sleeping in congregate dormitories; where there must be routine, formality, and restraint and repression of individuality; where the charms and refining influences of the true family relation cannot be had, all such institutions are unnatural, undesirable, and very liable to abuse. We should have as few of them as possible, and those few should be kept as small as possible. We should be cautious about establishing artificial communities, or those approaching them in character, for any children. . . . Beware how you sever any of those ties of family, of friendship, of neighbourhood *during the period of strongest growth*, lest you make a homeless man, a wanderer, a stranger. Especially beware how you cause him to neglect forming early relations of affection with those whose sympathy and friendship will be most important to him during life . . . and how you restrict him to such relations with persons of an infirmity like his own.'[1] The latter remarks were made with reference to the blind, but they apply with equal force to pauper children. If circumstances should make residence in an institution a necessity, Dr. Howe would limit it to the shortest possible period; while the object of the training should be to fit the children to live usefully and happily in the outer world.

We will cite one more example of the beneficent influences of home life, even on those of criminal propensities. On becoming Recorder of Birmingham, the late Matthew Davenport Hill pursued, with regard to juvenile criminals, a plan he had seen successfully practised by the Magistrates of the Warwickshire Sessions, and which seems almost an anticipation of a part of the Massachusetts Probationary Scheme. If the employer were willing to take the delinquent back—often indeed the urgency with which the request to be allowed to do so was made indicated the same generous self-devotion which leads the foster-parent to ask for a suffering child—the Recorder, unless the

[1] *Address at the laying of the Corner Stone of the New York State Institution for the Blind*, 1866, by P. G. Howe. Boston: Walker, Fuller, & Co.

crime had been of too serious a nature, consigned the young person again to his care. The reclamation of a large proportion of these young persons was attributed by Mr. Hill to the conditions of family life and the fact of the child having become an object of kindly interest to his master.

Considering that the advantages of Boarding-out are now generally recognised, at least in theory; considering too the surpassing value which the people of England profess to set upon home life, we cannot but echo Mr. Parnie's words of surprise at the slow progress of this plan amongst us. 'I see you are so much hampered with your law. To me it seems strange that you should be discussing with such solemnity the difficulty of Boarding-out. The system is obviously good, and it is brought in Scotland to such perfection, and benefits the children so much, that it is astonishing to hear the subject discussed, and to learn the real difficulties that seem to be in your way.'[1]

One of these real difficulties is found in the big schools already built. It seems an extravagant policy to suggest closing them, and yet it may be more wasteful to keep them open. Reporting the speeches made at the last annual meeting (1888) of the Association for the Advancement of Boarding-out, an influential evening paper, friendly to the cause, commented on the inexpediency of denouncing big pauper schools, and desiring their abolition, asserting that as long as there were casual children and ins and outs to be provided for, such schools would be absolutely necessary.[2] The plea of a necessary evil sometimes indicates want of originality and resource in those who have to deal with that evil. The Sheffield Board of Guardians, as we have seen, are resolved to grapple with it, and to prove that there is no logical necessity connecting pauper children with pauper schools. The Leeds Guardians have already demonstrated this proposition; but at present they provide for their ins

[1] *Report of the Conference on the System of Boarding-out.* Speech of the Chairman of the Parochial Board, Barony Parish, Glasgow.

[2] *St. James's Gazette*, June 19th, 1888.

and outs in the workhouse. It is in the Isolated Homes of Sheffield we see the unravelling of the difficulty concerning this class, who will there undergo a sifting process, and be kept separate from the permanents. The Sheffield scheme, carefully worked, will, we firmly believe, secure both efficiency and economy in dealing with all classes of the children, and will thus give the final blow to the prestige of the big schools. But unfortunately these buildings cannot be dispersed like Staff and children, and it would be futile to expect a Board administering rates to fling away their cost. Some practical means of escape from so dire a necessity must therefore be found.

In 1885 the Paddington Guardians, anxious to free themselves from the burden of their share in the Ashford Schools, advertised it for sale; but on applying to the Local Government Board for the co-operation necessary to complete the arrangement, they were informed their action was premature, and were asked their reasons for wishing to be severed from the School District. These were ably stated in an answer by their Clerk,[1] but the Department has not yet sanctioned their proposal. The Paddington Guardians are thus still obliged to pay their quota towards the maintenance of the Schools; but in the interests of the children they have removed those eligible for boarding-out, although by the enforced contribution to Ashford they gain nothing by the low boarding-out rate. But it is possible that by this removal they have averted, or at least postponed, enlarging the Schools, and thereby saved themselves and the other parishes who are joint-owners great additional expense; an additional expense, however, which will have sooner or later to be incurred by all Boards if the number of children sent to the Schools increases. Meanwhile Paddington is spending upon its pauper children nearly three times as much as it need do, a calculation which applies, with allowance for some variation in the cost of the large schools, to most Metropolitan parishes and to many in the country. No wonder Mr. Hardcastle, Guardian for St. George's, Hanover Square, expressed the wish that his Board

[1] Appendix III.

'could by any possibility get out of the Schools without an enormous pecuniary loss.'[1]

Kirkdale Schools are now larger than are required by Liverpool, to which they belong, and the approaching withdrawal of the West Derby children will increase the excess of space. The class sent there from Liverpool seems to be limited to the ins and outs (for whom provision in Isolated Homes on the Sheffield plan might be made), and those permanent children who will probably be eligible for boarding-out under the revised Order; and thus, for economy's sake, the question what to do with this Old Man of the Sea (as the big School is proving to many a Sinbad in the guise of a Board of Guardians) may soon have to be faced. A year ago it was proposed to relieve pressure at the workhouse by transferring infirm adults to the school. The idea was very properly dropped, and a large building had to be hired for their accommodation; but similar need may again arise, and if the children have been removed from Kirkdale it may afford an easy method of meeting it. An edifice of like character, though not a pauper school, was in 1887 acquired by the St. Pancras Board of Guardians for the reception of five hundred adults whom it was necessary to remove from their workhouse. Other purposes may in time be found for those buildings. Some might be suitable for Convalescent Institutions, and others might, by being adapted for the accommodation of soldiers, become qualified to bear by right the title of 'barracks' now applied as a by-word of reproach. As we get more and more to appreciate the importance of distributing the children, school buildings very near the Metropolis or other large towns may be valuable as temporary depôts for them when awaiting dispersion, as we see them utilised in Australia and foreign countries. The initial step, however, towards not using schools is to build no more; and we earnestly hope, alike in the interests of the ratepayers and the children, that every Board of Guardians called upon to provide additional accommodation for adults or juveniles will begin by considering how far it may be obtained, for the first by appro-

[1] Evidence before the Select Committee on Poor Relief [H. L.], 1888.

priating to them the space occupied by the children, and for the last by Boarding-out, Isolated Homes, and voluntary Certified Homes, the supply of which is sure to increase in proportion to the demand.[1]

Another serious hindrance to the reform of existing methods of dealing with these children, a lion in the path—is want of special central organisation. As we have shown, the Colonial Governments with their few thousands, or even hundreds, of children, have considered it necessary to devote a Department exclusively to them. We at home confide our vast numbers to Boards of Guardians weighted with a variety of affairs, and to a branch of Government loaded with an overwhelming amount of important business of other kinds. No wonder the children's interests are overlaid by those of often apparently greater moment.

The advantage of a special Department for State Children would be very great. To such a Board might be invited, here as elsewhere, voluntary workers. It would accumulate invaluable experience; it would enable State guardianship to be extended to a more advanced age; and, we trust, it would be unbiassed by local or party interest. Financially too, the Board would be of benefit. Colonial Boards have on several occasions discovered and recovered legacies due to the State children, but seized by other people, generally relations. Such instances would presumably be of rare occurrence in England, though we have known a case where a destitute orphan was entitled to £50 on coming of age, and obtained it only through the exertions of the Secretary to its Boarding-out committee, the Board of Guardians declining to take action because of the time and trouble this would entail. The suggested State Board might also be empowered, as in France, to receive public legacies and bequests intended for the particular benefit of destitute children. With us large sums of money are often spent in charity for children whose relations ought to support them, or to contribute to their

[1] The Kensington Guardians are, we believe, at this moment, considering the expediency of resuming Boarding-out to avoid the great expense of enlarging their Schools at Banstead.

wants in illness, while the really destitute are left wholly to the poor's rate. There may be no legal impediment to Guardians receiving legacies on behalf of pauper children, but we do not think the opportunity would tempt possible testators.

In an earlier chapter we have spoken of improvements in the schools; and in other directions, in spite of the slowness of Poor Law reforms, the retrospect of the years since the first edition of this book appeared is encouraging. Some abuses which then prevailed have been modified, and others have been swept away. Classification in the workhouses, though still defective, is less neglected, the sick generally are better cared for (though in country workhouses much yet is needed), while some of the infirmaries in the metropolis and other large towns are now model establishments. Indeed, in respect to these, the danger now seems to be in the opposite extreme of luxury. The diminution of out-relief, chiefly as regards London in the East End, and, in the provinces, markedly at Atcham and Bradfield in Berkshire, is showing how we may stop one serious leakage through which the independence and providence, and worse still, too often the humane feelings of our poor threatened to sink to the lowest ebb. A whole village thus degraded, as described in the Rev. G. T. Mozley's *Reminiscences*, is, we trust, now impossible. The direct influence of this reform upon our special subject will be seen when it is remembered how large a proportion of the children of the State, nearly four-fifths of the whole, are in receipt of out-relief; and the importance will be recognised of abolishing what, by bringing the young in habitual contact with the apparatus for distributing the parish dole, must be a very school of pauperism. Boarding-out is officially classified as 'Out-relief,' but the virus is destroyed if the children are effectually guarded from a knowledge of their dependence on parochial funds.

The principles which should guide giving aid to the poor are becoming more and more the subject of serious study, and are daily better understood. A practice begun several years ago by a few Boards of Guardians of publishing

Annual Reports of their proceedings is extending; these enable the public to judge for themselves how relief is administered, and some constitute practical treatises of high value.[1]

It is gratifying, and, shall we add, somewhat diverting also, that a 'new departure' very early advocated by Miss Louisa Twining and recommended in the first edition of this book, and needing then an elaborate vindication, much resembling defence,—that, namely, of women sharing the duties of Poor Law Guardians, is now an accomplished fact, occurring too frequently to provoke comment, except perhaps of approval. The revolution was at last effected without fuss or serious opposition, and its good results are generally acknowledged. The number of women who have yet accepted election is small, indeed less, in 1888, than seventy out of, we believe, some nineteen thousand Guardians —a mere drop in the ocean, especially when we consider how large a proportion of the work urgently needs the particular qualifications of women for its satisfactory performance. But their increasing willingness to stand, and that of the constituencies to elect them, presents an amusing contrast to the conviction which prevailed, at any rate in official quarters, not many years ago. The question whether the election of a woman to this office would be legal having been put to the Department by a Board of Guardians, their Clerk was informed, in answer, 'that the Poor Law Amendment Act, which defines the legal qualifications for guardians, contains no words which in themselves would restrict the eligibility of persons to be elected to that office to persons who are males. But,' continues the letter, showing how shocked the official mind had been by the suggestion, 'the objections to the appointment of a female to an office of this nature, upon grounds of public policy and convenience, are so manifest, that the Board cannot readily suppose that the question will become one of practical importance in the administration of the Poor Laws.'[2]

[1] Among those we have had the advantage of consulting, we would particularly mention the *Reports* of Whitechapel, and Bradfield.

[2] *Official Circular*, No. 38, N. S., June 1850.

Experience shows that public policy and convenience have not suffered from women's aid in the administration of public charity, and in co-operating in such matters as relate to the details of sick-nursing, tendance of children, and care of the aged.

Women who wish to devote themselves seriously to the relief of the afflicted poor will find ample scope for their aspirations in the office of Guardians. They look upon the problem from a different side from that of men, and bring fresh light to bear upon it. Their sex is distinguished by a gift for detail, and a power of individualisation constantly needed in the affairs of an institution which includes Hospital, Refuge, Crêche, School, and Lunatic Asylum, and, to some extent, Gaol too. Their familiarity with all that appertains to the needs of domestic life makes them at home in the main duties of workhouse management. They are able as a rule to spare more leisure than men can give, while their presence on a Board tends to raise its tone.

The questions that arise for decision by Guardians, whether male or female, demand a knowledge of the poor in their many classes, and of the principles at least of the Poor Law, and some acquaintance with other methods of helping them. Together with ready sympathy with suffering there must be the self-control which can postpone granting appeals, however harrowing, until their justice is ascertained. Moreover, feeling for the individual—and this perhaps is the danger women have most to guard against—must not impair adherence to principles applicable to all. We are not aware that it occurs to men, on undertaking to solve problems affecting for good or evil perhaps the whole lives of those whose cases they adjudicate, to prepare themselves for the task they have accepted; but we will venture to urge upon women who intend to offer themselves as Guardians some introductory study in preparation for duties among the most important of all that fall to citizens to discharge. Material for such study may be found in work upon Charity Organisation Committees and Workhouse Visiting Societies, and in the writings of some standard author on the administration of Poor relief; while a

knowledge of the working of our best elementary schools will help this training. Perhaps more useful than any one of the means indicated, certainly as regards the care of the children, would be a diligent study of Mrs. Nassau Senior's Report to the Local Government Board.

It is not to be denied that much that is painful and even disgusting must be faced by a Guardian of the Poor. And this is still sometimes urged as a reason why ladies should not undertake the post. But is high culture to unfit women even to hear of evils which their less fortunate sisters and even little children must daily encounter and perhaps daily suffer—evils which that high culture is especially qualified, if strengthened by the breadth of view and keen moral sense which should accompany it, to combat? It is not a possession to be reserved merely for the owner's enjoyment, which would be none the less selfish because refined. Nor is there any fear that purity will suffer from contact with even the grossest form of depravity if encountered for a noble end. Purity is not sullied in striving to appease suffering and reclaim from sin; and just as the strongest men are the most gentle, so we believe the most cultivated and most modest women are best fitted to deal with the ignorant and depraved. As Guardians, too, ladies are of great value to the female officers of the staff, and help to attract to it a high class of women, thus aiding to maintain and strengthen that upward movement which is more and more making Mr. and Mrs. Bumble legends of the past.

A marked feature in pauper administration to-day, as compared with that of twenty years ago, is its growing willingness to avail itself of voluntary help and co-operation, thus fulfilling the original scheme of our present Poor law. 'As one of its framers has remarked,' says Miss Cobbe, 'those laws were designed to form a mere bony skeleton, indicating the form and affording a basis for the flesh of voluntaryism to make a living body of national charity. By a fatal result of jealousy and routine, the voluntary element has been too often excluded, and we have only a fearful spectre haunting with death-like image all the lower vaults of our social fabric. Let free charity be not only permitted

but invited to enter these English Towers of Oblivion (dread as that which frowned over old Byzantium), and a new order of things will swiftly arise for the child and the young woman, for the fallen, the aged, and the sick.'[1] Thus Miss Cobbe wrote in 1861. M.A.B.Y.S., and the Girls' Friendly Society, the Workhouse Visiting Associations with their committees for special aid to young women, Lady Brabazon's Scheme for cheering the aged and infirm, and voluntary Boarding-out Committees, are nobly fulfilling her prophecy.

The awakening interest of the public in Poor-law administration has brought vivid recognition of the shortcomings, and in some instances, unhappily, the wrong-doings of its administrators; and the Poor-law Guardian is apt to be referred to depreciatingly as ignorant or self-seeking. Such, undoubtedly, some are, but a far larger number are genuinely interested in their work, and are sacrificing time, labour, and self-advancement with a generosity and public spirit which others would do well to emulate. Our more wealthy and leisured classes expose themselves to ridicule, if not contempt, by criticising the manner in which public work is done, if they indolently neglect to take their share. Though with many noble exceptions there has, in regard to the work of the Poor law, assuredly been supineness. It is not ladies only who are needed to repair the evils that have crept in through the selfish disregard of a great public duty. The refined and high-minded of both sexes, to whatever rank in life they belong, will find ample work to do, demanding every gift of station, culture, good sense, and honesty of purpose, in raising their fellow-citizens out of the slough of pauperism by the best attainable administration of poor-relief. Closer contact with the suffering poor, through these and many other agencies, is not without its beneficent effect on the better off and the better educated. It is impossible to be brought face to face with their hard daily struggle and wonderful endurance, and not gain a firmer grasp of the realities of life, and of the moral obligation and purifying necessity of work and mutual sacrifice.

We would, too, again urge that those who are unwilling

[1] *Macmillan's Magazine*, April 1861.

or unable to join in active work for the poor, are still bound to inform themselves of the views of those who come forward to represent them on the Board of Guardians, and to record their votes in behalf of the most worthy. They cannot be exonerated from this duty even by the absorbing claims and interests of intellectual pursuits, wealth, and social advancement. Indeed, these only make the obligation the more imperative,—unless the argument of the old lady is admitted to be valid, who excused herself for not giving to charities on the plea of the large sum she had to pay as income tax.

We trust the office of Guardian will be more and more recognised as one in which men can render noble service, while the training it gives is excellent for higher offices and public business generally, a fact pointed out in one of the Essays of the late Sir Henry Taylor years ago.

But though we look forward hopefully, we do not delude ourselves with the belief that the time will come when pauperism, though it may be greatly diminished, will wholly cease to be. Neither legislation nor change of government, nor redistribution of wealth, nor education itself, will alter the radical laws of human nature. Ever among us we shall have some who are vicious, or indolent, or incapable, or afflicted. But what we may reasonably hope, and it is much, is that more and more will children be saved from the brand of pauperism, and passing under the control of the State, receive at her hands the good gift of honest and loving family life; then, neither disgracing her in after years, nor ashamed themselves of her guardianship, shall they rise up and call her blessed.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

APPENDIX I (p. 203)

BARTON REGIS UNION

REPORT *on*_____

a Child in the Workhouse proposed to be 'Boarded-out.'

Age of Child_____. Legitimate or illegitimate_____

Place of Birth_____

Residence prior to admission into Workhouse_____

Whether an Orphan or Deserted Child_____

If Deserted, Name of Parent_____

Length of time Deserted_____

Where Parent supposed to be_____

When last heard of_____

If an Orphan, the Name, Residence, and Occupation of last surviving Parent_____

Where did last surviving Parent die_____

Date of Death of last surviving Parent_____

Name and Residence, etc. of the nearest known Relative or Friend of the Child_____

Parish to which Child is supposed to belong, or is it irremovable . . . . ._____

Religion of Child's Parents_____

Special Observations_____

Signed_____ Relieving Officer.

Dated_____ 18____

APPENDIX II (p. 338)

PAYMENTS FOR BOARDED-OUT CHILDREN

France (Department of the Seine, which including Paris, has to deal with a majority of the children for the whole country, and scatters them over several Provinces)—

Age.	Rate.
1 day to 12 months	18 francs a month
1 year to 2 years	15 ,, ,,
2 ,, 3 ,,	12 ,, ,,
3 ,, 4 ,,	10 ,, ,,
4 ,, 6 ,,	8 ,, ,,
6 ,, 9 ,,	7 ,, ,,
9 ,, 12 ,,	6 ,, ,,

[In the Provinces local Boarding-out is paid for at lower rates, but with similar diminution in amount as the child grows older.]

Germany—Babies at the rate of 15s. a month
Older children a decreasing rate, as in France.

Vienna—1st year 4 florins a month
2d ,, 3 florins 34 kreuzers a month
Above that age 2 ,, 66 ,, ,,

Ireland—The Protestant Orphan Society (founded in 1828, and which has dealt with about three thousand children) paid originally—

Under 2 years	£4 per annum
Afterwards	£3 10s. ,,

These rates were subsequently raised to—

Under 1 year	£5 per annum
Afterwards	£4 ,,

Cork Union (which has boarded-out nearly eleven hundred children since 1862, with a marvellous saving of infant life)—

Age.	Rate.
Under 2 years	£8 a year
„ 5 „	£6 14s. „
„ 13 „	£7 6s. „

Scotland—Varies greatly; in some parishes £6 per annum; in the Barony Parish, Glasgow, £10 : 10s., besides clothing, school-fees, and medical attendance when needed. This rate is probably the highest.

England—Maximum, somewhat over £13 per annum
Minimum £11 1s.[1] „

Victoria (Australia)—

Under 1 year	12s. a week (including wet-nursing)
Afterwards	5s. „

South Australia—Rates vary according to requirements—

Maximum, 7s. a week, which is paid for infants and sickly children.

New Zealand—Formerly—

Under 7	8s. a week
„ 10	1s. less a week
Above 10	by agreement.

These rates have been revised, and the payment is now—

Above 1 year	7s. a week
Under „	more, according to requirements.

[1] This is the average cost of children under the King's Norton Committee.

APPENDIX III (p. 345).

PADDINGTON WORKHOUSE,
24th June 1885.

SIR—I am directed by the Board of Guardians to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th ultimo, and in reply to state that they consider that a large school is not the best place wherein to bring up Pauper Children.

Children cannot receive in such a school the personal supervision so essential to the uprooting of bad qualities, and to the development of good qualities; a personal supervision, moreover, all the more necessary when the antecedents of many of the parents are taken into account.

In support of this view I am requested to call your attention to the following extract of a speech made by Sir Charles Dilke, Bt., M.P., on the 18th of March last, at a meeting of the Chelsea Branch of the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants—'However well the great District Schools were worked, the mere fact of bringing together hundreds of girls in an enormous building must result in the weakening of individual character. There could be no individuality of training in these large institutions; everything must be on a large scale. It was by no means a bad beginning in the training of a servant, but it was certainly a bad end. Life in the great district schools was necessarily in many things exactly the reverse of life in a small home, and a child who had spent all her life in one of those vast institutions could hardly be said to be fitted for domestic service. He himself was an advocate of the cottage-home system, as being one likely to give the girls a much better insight into the duties of their future life than could be acquired in one of the district schools. The system was, however, a very costly one, and consequently, had not met with much success, so that it was necessary now—and was likely to be, at all events for some

years to come—to cope with the disadvantages connected with the great barrack schools.'

The multiple control is especially undesirable in it. There is a tendency to a loss of perfect responsibility to the rate-payers.

As regards the best manner of dealing with pauper children the Guardians consider:—

(1) That deserted children and orphans should be either emigrated or boarded-out, and they greatly regret that they are by law precluded from dealing with other children in like manner.

(2) That the children of vicious parents, or of parents who have shown themselves unmindful of their duties towards their children, or who are unable to fulfil them, should be brought up in small country homes, under the control of Guardians, containing not more than 20 children each, and, if found convenient, should be educated at the village school.

(3) That the cases of children of parents of good repute should be specially considered, in order that, if advisable, the parents should be constituted the children's guardians, and a weekly sum allowed, sufficient, with the parents' earnings, to enable the children to be properly brought up.

As regards this last class of cases the Guardians recognise that the action proposed would have to be carefully watched, and only agreed upon after thorough inquiry; but they believe that such methods of dealing with their pauper children will be more economical as well as more effective than the present system.

In conclusion, I am to state that the Guardians are sensible that there are financial difficulties attending the proposed changes, and they would be glad to be favoured with the opinion of the Local Government Board thereon, as well as upon the other views expressed above.—I have, etc.,

HENRY F. AVELING, *Clerk.*

To S. B. PROVIS, Esq.,
Assistant Sec. Local Government Board.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF BOARDING-OUT.

For assisting (in concert with Boards of Guardians and others) the Boarding-out of Orphan and Destitute Children.

Patroness
H.R.H. THE DUCHESS OF ALBANY.

President
THE RIGHT HON. VISCOUNT CRANBROOK, G.C.S.I.

Hon. Secretaries
MISS WILHELMINA L. HALL. MISS AKERS.

Assistant Secretary—MISS S. E. CLARK.

Office—22 BERNERS STREET, LONDON, W.

Hon. Treasurer—REV. EDWIN PRICE.

Bankers
MESSRS. MARTIN & CO., 68 LOMBARD STREET.

OBJECTS.

I.—To form a link of communication between Boards of Guardians wishing to board-out orphan and deserted children, and others included under the Local Government Board Order of 1870, and certified Boarding-out Committees willing to receive them; also, to facilitate exchange of information between the several Boarding-out Committees.

II.—To obtain information as to the working of the Local Government Board Order of 1877 for regulating out-relief to orphan and deserted children *within the Union.*

III.—To enquire into the operation of the various systems of Boarding-out.

IV.—Generally to co-operate in all measures for the promotion of Boarding-out, and for the welfare of the children thus provided for.

PUBLICATIONS ON THE TRAINING OF PAUPER CHILDREN.

The Family System for Workhouse Children, *Contemporary Review*, Sept. 1870.

Report of Conference on the Bringing-up and Education of Pauper Children, April 1883. Social Science Association, 1 Adam Street, Adelphi. Price 1s.

Hereditary Pauperism and Boarding-out, by VISCOUNT CRANBROOK, G.C.S.I. *National Review*, December 1883.

Address delivered at the Conference of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, by RICHARD HUMBLE. Petty and Sons, Trinity Street, Leeds. 1883.

Discussion in the Plymouth Court of Guardians on Boarding-out, December 1883; with Introduction by FLORENCE DAVENPORT HILL. Knight and Co., Fleet Street, E.C. Price 2d.

The Education of Pauper Children; Industrially and Otherwise, by Rev. JAS. O. BEVAN, M.A., F.G.S. Herald Press, Birmingham. 1884.

Report of the Conference on the System of Boarding-out Orphan and Deserted Children, edited by Blanche A. F. Pigott. London: Bale and Sons, Great Titchfield Street. 1885.

The Preventive and Curative Means of Treating the Young, by Rev. EDMUND V. PIGOTT. Bemrose and Sons, Derby. 1885. Price 6d.

'Boarding-out, as a Method of Pauper Education, and a Check on Hereditary Pauperism.' Paper read at the Birmingham Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1886, by WILHELMINA L. HALL. Hatchards, Piccadilly. Price 4d.

Report of Sixteenth Annual Central Poor Law Conference. 'The Boarding-out of Pauper Children,' by JOANNA M. HILL. Knight and Co., 90 Fleet Street, E.C. 1888. Price 6d.

The following may be obtained at the Office of the Association:—

A List of Boarding-out Committees certified by the Local Government Board under the Order of 1870, with names of Secretaries, and Unions which Board out. Price 4d.

Leaflets on Boarding-out, Nos. 1-13, reprinted from the *Charity Organization Review*. 3d. per dozen.

Annual Reports of the Association.

INDEX

ADAMSON, Rev. William, 18
Adamson, Mr. (of Glasgow), 157, 165 *et seq.*
Addlestone Homes, 316
Address on Laying Corner Stone of Institution for the Blind, 343
Age for detention of State children, 226, 242, 248, 251, 270
Alden, Mr., 230
Algeria, proposal to establish Colony of State Children in, 284
Amsterdam, Boarding-out from, 301
Anderdon, Miss, 109
Apprentice House, history of the, 136 *et seq.*
Apprenticeship, 136 *et seq.*, 237, 249, 254, 263, 333
Archer, Mrs., 29, 71, 94, 175 *et seq.*, 194, 312
Archer, Mr. David, 68
Armitstead, Rev. John, 175 *et seq.*
Arnold, Mr. Matthew, 62
Arnott, Sir John, 150 *et seq.*
Ashford Schools, 81, 95, 345
Ashton Workhouse, *Report* by Master and Matron of, 140
Association for the Advancement of Boarding-out, 43, 190, 344
Aston, Guardians of, 187
Atkinson, Mrs., 35, 115
Aubin, Mr., 10
Austria, Boarding-out in, 302
Aveling, Mr., 132, 348, 358

BANSTEAD Cottage Homes, 88 *et seq.*, 347
Barnett, Rev. S. A., 14
Barnett, Mrs. S. A., 34
Barton Regis, Guardians of, 203, 309
Bath, Boarding-out at, 182, 314
Report of Boarding-out Committee, 68; Return of Children sent out from, 37
Battenberg, Princess Louis of, 295 *et seq.*
Beattie, Mr. (Glasgow), 165, 167
Beauchamp, The Lady, 110
Belgium, Boarding-out in, 301
Belgravia, 50
Bell, Mr. G. W., letter from, 55
Bence Jones, the late Dr., 196
Bethnal Green, Guardians of, 183, 187; Children Boarded-out from, 189
Betzky (Russia), 297
Birmingham, prizes taken by Pauper Children at, 44; Separate School of, 91; Guardians of, 182, 186
Blyth, Sir Arthur, K.S.M.G., 236
Board of Health, Lunacy, and Charity Reports of, 227 *et seq.*
Boarded-out Children, Low Mortality of, 163, 259; *Report* on (Glasgow), 163
Boarding-out an aid in the Repression of Crime, 336
Boarding-out, Association for Advancement of, 43, 190, 344
Committees, respective advantages of large and small, 212
Conference on, 95, 190; *Report of*, 344
Effect of, in lessening cost, 231, 237, 256, 259, 318; in saving life, 259, 337
Order, 1870, 183 *et seq.*, 312
Order, 1877, 312 *et seq.*; alleged cruelty under, 321 *et seq.*

Scales of payment under, 163, 186, 192, 195, 236, 251, 259, 267, 280 *et seq.*, 302, 318, 355
Boarding-out and Pauper Schools, 36, 202
Boarding-out System, Practical Guide to, 208, 312 *et seq.*, 342
Boarding-out System Vindicated, 37
Bode, Baron de, 298
Boucherett, Miss, 179 *et seq.*, 191
Boudet, Dr., 284
Bourchier, Captain, R.N., 54
Bowyer, Mr. (H. G.), 63, 66, 97, 113
Boy's Own Paper, 253
Brace, Rev. C. L., 215, 218 *et seq.*
Bradfield, 348 ; *Report* of Guardians of, 349
Bram, Andreas, 287 *et seq.*
Bridgend Cottage Homes, 93, 326
Bridges, Dr., 68, 79, 80, 83
Brochard, Dr., 284
Brockham Home, 101 *et seq.*
Browne, Dr. (the late), 160
Browne, Mr. T. Ll. Murray, 26
Browne, Mr. T. B. (the late), 72
Bruèyre, Monsieur Loys, 283
Brumauld, l'Abbé, 284
Brussels, Boarding-out at, 301
Bureau St. Appoline, 275
Burton, Mr. F. R., 238
Byron, Lady (the late), 15

CALVERTON, Boarding-out at, 189, 200
Cambridge Boarding-out Committee, 188
Canada, Emigration to, 7, 129 *et seq.*, 333
First Report on the Placing-out of Pauper and other Orphans in, 131
Carpenter, Mary, 128, 339
Catherine II, 298
Cave, Rt. Hon. Stephen, 102
Chadwick, Mr. Edwin, 46, 331
Chambers, Mr. William (the late), 100
Charitable Grants Department (Tasmania), *Report of*, 266 *et seq.*
Charity Organisation Review, 204
Charity, Annual Conferences of, U.S.A., 225, 230
Charlton Convalescent Cottage Home, 107
Charrington, Mr. John, 50
Cherbuliez, 312
Chertsey, Boarding-out at, 313
Children's Aid Society (New York), 215, 218, 221
Numbers placed out by, 221
Reports of, 221
'Children of the State,' definition of the term, 2
Child-saving Institutions, 215
Chorlton cum Medlock, Guardians of, 182, 187, 314, 340
Church Choirs, pauper children admitted to, 114
Clark, Miss, 236 *et seq.*
Clay, Rev. W. L., 306 *et seq.*
Clinton, The Lady, 110
Clutterbuck, Dr., 74
Cobbe, Miss Frances Power, 37, 236 351
Colton, Mrs., 238
Communion of Labour, 115
Comparative Cost of Boarding-out, Schools, and Cottage Homes, 318
Conference on National Education, 339
Conference on Poor-Law Administration (1872), 202
Conseil, General des Hospices, 275
Corbière (the Minister), 283
Cork, Boarding-out at, 152 *et seq.*
Workhouse, Scrofula at, 327
Investigation into Condition of, 151
Ophthalmia at, 198
Cost at Metropolitan Pauper Schools, 96
at Provincial, 97
at Certified Homes, 103 *et seq.*
in Schools, New South Wales, 257
of a Pauper, 331
Cottage Training Homes, Association for Promoting, 109
Courtney, Mr. H. D., 82
Cranbrook, The Lord, 95
Critchett (the late) Mr., 83
Crofton, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter, 228
Cropper, Mr. James, 105, 109

DEMETZ, Monsieur, 293
Denison's Act, 306
Desertion not encouraged by Boarding-out, 167, 204, 259, 263, 270
Destitute Act Commission (South Australia), 240; *Report of*, 226, 229, 235 *et seq.*, 254 *et seq.*
Devizes, Home at, 103
Devon, The Countess of (the late), 106
Devon, the Lord (the late), 102
Doyle, Mr. Andrew (the late), 92, 131 *et seq.*, 293
Drawing-room Conference on Boarding-out, Report of, 190
Drouet, Mr., 142
Dumbness not discovered in workhouse school, 56
Duncan, Mr. George O. (the late), 246, 249

EALING GROVE, 15
Education Reports (New Zealand), 270
Edward III, Act of, 143
Elementary Education Act, 25 (1873), 307
Elementary Schools, attendance at, by pauper children, 42
Ely District School, 326
Emigration, 7, 129 *et seq.*, 333
Emigration of Destitute Children, 132
Emigration of Pauper Children to Canada, 131
Emigration Training Home, 133
Enfants en Depôt, 283
Englishwoman's Review, 179
Eton, Boarding-out at, 181
Exmouth training ship, 7, 53

FARNINGHAM, Homes for Little Boys, 316
Fawcett, Professor, 203 *et seq.*
Fletcher, Mrs., 284
Autobiography of, 285
Föhrung, Dr., 293
Fordyce, Major, 128
Forest Gate District School, 86, 90
Forster, Rt. Hon. W. E., 307
Foster-parents, find places for foster children, 199 *et seq.*
Fosterage, 11
Foundling Hospital boards-out, 336
Friendless Girls and how to help them, 38
Fry, Mrs., 285

General Consolidated Poor Law Order, July 1847, 3
Girls' Friendly Society, 41, 128, 352
Girls' Own Paper, 254
Good Words, 228
Gordon Homes, 108
Goschen, Rt. Hon. G. J., 183
Govan, inspector of, 171
Grant, Colonel R. E., 68, 182, 208, 312 *et seq.*, 341
Grant, Mrs., 315
Gray Coat School, 8
Gray, Mr. (South Australia), 241
Greig, Mr. George, 148, 155 *et seq.*, 194, 236, 329
Grimmond, Mr., 162
Guardians of the Poor, difficulties of, 51; duties and powers of, 5; duty of public concerning, 331, 353; women as, 349
Guillaume, Mr. George, 246, 253 *et seq.*, 259, 270

HABENS, Mr., 268
Hadden, Rev. R. H., *Evidence of*, 41
Halifax, The Viscountess, 107
Hall, Miss Wilhelmina L., *Evidence of*, 184
Hamilton, the Duke of, 169
Hamilton, Rev. G. Hans, 306
Hammersmith Probationary School, 90, 91
Hancock, Dr. Neilson (the late), 143, 147, 150
Hanway, Sir Jonas, *Act* of, 9
Hanwell District School, 10, 55, 78, *et seq.*, 181
Hardcastle, Mr., *Evidence of*, 59, 346
Hartismere Separate School, 66, 326
Hastings, Mr. G. W., M.P., 114
Hawley, Mr., 177
Hay, Mr. W. (Dundee), 166
Headingley, Cottage Homes at, 316

Henley, Mr. J. J., 60, 166 *et seq.*, 183, 194, 198 *et seq.*, 203, 311, 313; *Report of* on Boarding-out in Scotland, 60
Herford, Mr. C. J., 182, 314 *et seq.*
Herne Bay Infirmary, 87, 88
Highworth and Swindon Union, 68; Boarding-out at, 176
Hill, Miss Joanna M., 17, 165
Hill, Mr. Matthew Davenport, 343
Hill, Miss Octavia, 32, 297
Hislop, Dr., 268
Histoire des Enfants Abandonnés et Delaissés, 283, 293, 299, 303
Hoffmann, Josef, 224
Holborn Union, sick children of, 76
Holding, Mr. John, 132
Holgate, Mr. Wyndham, 25, 63, 66, 81, 87
Holland, Hon. Sydney, 69
Holmes, Rev. E. W., 335
Holtzendorff, (the late) Baron von, 291
Home for Day-Servants, 125, 332; *Report of*, 125
Home in New Ormond Street, 119
Homes for Working Boys, 41, 128
Homes for Working Girls, 128
Hood, Thomas, 160
Horrocks, Mr., 263
Hospital Schools of Edinburgh, 100; of Paisley, 172
Howard Association, 228
Howard (the late), Hon. Mrs., 105
Howard Orphan Home, 105
Howard, The Lady Victoria, 107
Howe, Dr., 342 *et seq.*
Humble, Mr. Richard, 318

IDDESLEIGH (the late), Lord, 102
Illegitimate births in workhouses, 25
Imeson, Mr., 21
Improvements in pauper institutions, 28, 84, 99, 348
Industrial and Reformatory Schools (Victoria), *Reports of*, 256 *et seq.*
Inspection, Method of, 167, 204 *et seq.*, 241, 260, 262, 267 *et seq.*, 279
by Guardians, 208 *et seq.*
Inspector of Boarded-out Children (England), 321
Irish Education Inquiry (1825), 61
Irish Homes and Irish Hearts, 115, 148 *et seq.*
Irish Poor in Workhouses, The, 35
Irish Protestant Charter Schools, 61
'Isolated Homes,' 93, 345
Italy, Boarding-out in, 299

JAMESON, Mrs., 115
Jerusalem Chamber, Boarding-out Conference in, 95
Journal of the Workhouse Visiting Society, 34
Judell, Miss, 104
Juvenile Offenders Law Amendment Act (Victoria), 252

KEKEWICH, Mr., M.P., 38
Kendal, Howard Orphan Home at, 105
Kensington and Chelsea District School, 89
Kenton, Certified Home at, 106
Kidderminster, Guardians of, 187
Kilburn, Orphanage of Mercy, 111
King's Norton Boarding-out Committee, 182, 186 *et seq.*, 192
Reports issued by, 189, 199
Kirkdale School, 85, 346

'LADY BRABAZON'S Scheme,' 352
Lady Guardians, Conference of, 111
Lafabrégue, Monsieur, 284
Lallemand, Monsieur, 278 *et seq.*, 293, 299, 301
Lambert, Rev. Brooke, 120
Lamp, The, 148
Lancaster Reform School (Mass.) 224
Lazaretto School at Cork, 327
Leavesden Separate School, 84, 86, 90
Leeds, Boarding-out at, 316, 340
Guardians, 344 *et seq.*
Report of Boarding-out Committee, 317
Report by Mr. Mosley on Children Boarded-out at, 319
Leicester Separate School, 97
Leipzig, Boarding-out at, 294
Leominster, Boarding-out at, 175, 312

Les Enfants Assistés de la Seine, 278
Letchworth, Mr. W. P., 217, 223
Liefde, M. de, 287
Limehouse, Separate School at, 48 *et seq.*, 69, 326
Llewellyn, Mr. J. T., 92

MACLEOD, Mr. (Machar), 171
Macmillan's Magazine, 352
M'Niel, Sir John, 165 *et seq.*
Maconochie, Captain, 117
Macpherson, Miss, 129 *et seq.*
Magill School, 235 *et seq.*
Evidence of Matron of, 235
Marston Green Cottage Homes, 20, 91, 187
Mary, Empress of Russia, 298
Marylebone Board of Guardians, 309
Mason, Miss, 321
Massachusetts, 'Probationary System of,' 224 *et seq.*; Results of, 228, 230, 242, 247, 249
Mead, Mrs., 40
Memorandum for Managers of Industrial Schools (New Zealand), 269
Memorial (1870) to the Local Government Board, 183
Metropolitan, 28, 79
Metropolitan Pauper Schools, cost at, 96
Metrop. Assoc. for Befriending Young Servants (M.A.B.Y.S.), 40, 120 *et seq.*, 201, 328, 352
Mettray, 293
Midcalder, Inspector of, 171
Middlemore, Mr. J. H., 133 *et seq.*
Mitcham Schools, 76, 84
Molyneux, Lady Cecilia, 105
Monson State Primary School (Mass.), 224, 225
Moore, (the late) Mr. George, 202
Mortality of Children in Workhouses in Ireland, 147, 150
Mortality of State Children—
France, 276, 284 *et seq.*; Russia, 298; Italy, 300
Mowatt, Dr., 83
Mozley, Mr. J. R., 28, 63; *Report of, on Children at Leeds*, 318 *et seq.*
Mozley, Rev. T., Reminiscences of, 348

NATIONALITY of Destitute Children (New York), 216
Neal, Mr. (the late), 246
Neglected Children, etc., Department (Victoria), Report of, 256
Nettleship, Mr., *Report of*, 76 *et seq.*
New South Wales, Boarding-out in, 257 *et seq.*
New South Wales Public Charities, Report on, 257
New York Juvenile Asylum, 218
New York State Legislature, *Act* of (1874), 222
New Zealand, Boarding-out in, 268
New Zealand Gazette, 268; *Minister of Education, Reports of*, 271
Nicholls, Sir George, on dual purpose of Poor-law, 14
Nineteenth Century, 14
Norwich Homes, 113, 173, 332
Norwood separate school, 86
Nottingham, improvements at, 28

ODESSA, Boarding-out at, 229
O'Hagan, Lord, 143
Oliver Twist, 6
Ophthalmia, 30, 76 *et seq.*, 86, 88, 97, 190, 198 *et seq.*, 214, 235, 327
Ophthalmic School, 327
Orphan Office (Berlin), 288
Orphanage of St. Petersburg, 297

PADDINGTON Board of Guardians, 309, 338, 348; their Clerk's Correspondence with Local Government Board, 345; cost of children, 95 *et seq.*
Paisley, 'hospital' children at, 60, 172
Pall Mall Gazette, 182
Parents, conditions of return of children to, 255
Parish, Miss C., 108
Parker, Mr. d'Esterre, 115, 152
Parnie, Mr., 344
Pauper Schools, cost of, 95 *et seq.*, 337; improvement of, 99; numbers in, 46

Pauperism: its Causes and Remedies, 203
Pauperism and the Boarding-out of Pauper Children in Scotland, 161 *et seq.*
Pauperism, Cost of, in England and Scotland, 161 *et seq.*; diminution of, 161 *et seq.*
Pauperism and Slavery, 15
Peel, the Rt. Hon. Arthur, M.P., 184 *et seq.*, 201, 341
Peyron, Monsieur, 61
Plea for the Extension of the Boarding-out System, 17
Philosophy of the Poor Laws, 38, 236
Pigott, Miss Blanche A. F., 73, 95
Pitman, Mrs. E. B., 285
Plymouth Boarding-out Committee, 188
Poor-law, dual purpose of, 14
Poor Relief Committee, 1861, 37; 1863 [H.C.], 178
Poor Relief, Committee on (H.L.), 1888, 41, 59, 69, 184, 346
Practical Guide to the Boarding-out System, 208, 312, 342
Preusser, Miss, 183, 187 *et seq.* 294; *Reports* issued by, 189
Princess Alice, The, 295 *et seq.*
Prince Consort, The, 339
Probationary Homes, 245, 249, 261
Protestant Charter Schools (Ireland), 61, 143
Protestant Orphan Society, 144 *et seq.*
Provis, Mr. S. B., C.B., 358
Public Relief to Orphans (Berlin), *Report on*, 290
Putnam, Miss Eliz. C., 228

Quarterly Review, 332
Quatt School, 52, 92
Queen Elizabeth, 321
Queensland, Boarding-out in, 262 *et seq.*
Inspector of Orphanages, Report of, 263
Question des Enfants Abandonnés et Delaissés, 278

RANDALL Island, Institution on, 216, 218
Rauhe Haus, 293
Reed, Mr. Thomas S., 237
Renwick, Hon. Arthur, 258
Revised Memorandum on Emigration, 134 *et seq.*
Richardson, Mrs. Anne B., 255
Robertson, Mr. R. (Paisley), 171
Robinson, Mr. W. F., 50
Rolleston, Hon. W., 268
Report on the City Parish, Glasgow, Relief Rolls, 165
Roudil, l'Abbé, 284
Rummelsberg, 289 *et seq.*
Russia, Boarding-out in, 298
Rye, Miss Maria S., 129 *et seq.*

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S Home, 103
St. Brigid's Orphanage, 148
St. George's, Hanover Square, Union, 69
St. James' Back Ragged School, 221
St. James's Gazette, 344
St. Pancras, 26, 64, 68, 75, 98, 196, 346
Schools, 316, 326
Workhouse, *Report on*, by the late Dr. Bence Jones, 196
Salford, Guardians of, 187
Sanborn, Mr. Francis, 215
Scheme for Befriending Pauper Orphan Girls, 29, 175
Schuyler, Miss Louisa Lee, 215, 222 *et seq.*, 339
Scotland, Report on Boarded-out Children in, 60, 166 *et seq.*, 312
Seddon, Rev. T., 133
Senior, Mr. Edward, 20
Senior, Mrs. Nassau, 27, 40, 59; *Report of*, 62, 64, 70, 82, 89, 107, 121, 124, 351
'Separated' children boarded-out in Scotland, 155, 311
Service des Enfants Assistés, 274
Service des Enfants Moralement Abandonnés, Rapport sur, 61, 283, 304
Seventh Conference of Charities, U.S.A., Report of, 225
Shaen, Mrs., 32
Sheffield Guardians, 93; their Scheme, 94, 344
Shepton Mallet Union, Master of, 25

Shuttleworth, Sir James Kay, Bart., 15, 46
Skelton, Mr. John, 161 *et seq.*, 259
Smedley, Miss Menella B., 36, 202, 294
Smith, Miss (Devizes), 103
Smith, Mr. James (South Australia), 240
Smith, Mr. Samuel, M.P., 134
Social Science Association *Sessional Proceedings*, 40, 54, 133, 321
Transactions of, 20, 35, 306, 339
Society for Boarding-out Destitute Children (New South Wales), *Report of*, 258
Somerset, Lady Henry, 110
Spain, Boarding-out in, 303
Spence, Miss Catherine, 241
Stanley, Lady Emma, 105
Standard, 43
Stansfeld, Rt. Hon. James, 62
State Board of Charities (New York), *Report of*, 217
State Charities Aid Society (New York), 215
Report of, 216, 222 *et seq.*, 231
State Children, Definition of, 2
Method of dealing with, in New Zealand, 269, 271; France, 276; Germany, 289
State Children's Council (South Australia), 242 *et seq.*; *Reports of*, 244 *et seq.*
Relief Board (New South Wales), 258 *et seq.*; *Report of*, 259
Special Department for, 347
Legacies recoverable for, 347
Stephen, Mr. Leslie, 204
Stewart, Mr. (Nairn), 167
Stirling, Dr. E. C., 244
Stoke upon Trent school, 97
Strand union school, 96
Stretton, Miss Hesba, 57, 108
Stubbs, Rev. J., 43
Sturge, Mr. Joseph, 229
Sutton (the late), Mr., 85
Sutton District-School, 51, 81, 85, 86, 88, 90
Swansea union, 92
Sweden, Boarding-out in, 303
Swimming baths, 90
Swinton School, 85, 316
Switzerland, Boarding-out in, 300
Symons, Mr. Jelinger C. (the late), 20, 53
Synnot, Miss, 107

TASMANIA, Boarding-out in, 265 *et seq.*
Taylor, Sir Henry, 353
Temporary Homes, 261
Thulié, Dr. H., 278 *et seq.*
Times, 21, 32, 55, 78, 257
Trevelyan (the late), Sir Charles E. Bart., 190
Trevelyan, Rev. W. P., 189, 193
Tufnell, Mr. Carleton, 17, 19, 30, 36, 45, 181, 196
Tufts, Mr. Gardner, 225, 227
Twelfth Annual Conference of Charity, U.S.A., *Report of*, 230
Twining, Miss Louisa, 31, 34 *et seq.*, 39, 110, 119

VAN DEN BOSCH, General, 301
Vanmeter, Rev. C., 221
Victoria, Method of dealing with State Children of, 249
Vienna, Boarding-out at, 302
Villiers, the Hon. C. P., 178

WAIFS and Strays Society, 108
Waisenpflege und Waisenkinder, 293
Waldon, John P., 264
Walsall and West Bromwich School, 97
Watson, Sheriff, 170
Way, Hon. Chief Justice, 237, 244
Way, Hon. Mrs., 37, 101 *et seq.*, 135
Way, Mrs. Lewis A., 102
West Derby Union, 105, 132, 140
Westborough Reform School (Mass.) 224
Western Daily Press, 310
Westminster Review, 58
Whitechapel Union and Local Government Board, Correspondence of, 209; *Report of*, 349
Whiting, Mr. (South Australia), 245
Whitmore, Mr. Wolryche (the late), 52

Whitmore, Rev. H. B. Wolryche, 52
Whitwell, Mr. Mark, 134
Wichern, Dr., 293
Williamson, Mrs., 104
Windeyer, Hon. Mr. Justice, 257
Windeyer, Mrs., 258
Wines, Dr. E. C., 215, 221, 231
Witham, 87
Wolverhampton, Home at, 104
Women as Poor Law Guardians, 349 *et seq.*
Woodlock, Mrs. (the late), 35, 115
Workhouse, discharges from, 69; proportion of unmarried mothers in, 25; Sunday in, 43; two grades of, 18; Visiting Society, *Journal of*, 34, 306; young women in, 32, 116 *et seq.*
Workhouse children: admitted to church choirs, 114; attendance at outside schools, 26, 42; classes of, 2; clothing of, 29; cruelty to, 17, 330; diet of, 27, 180; helplessness of, 57; instruction of, required by law, 25; methods of education of, 6, 8; mortality of, 150 *et seq.*, 263; number of, 3, 308; ophthalmia, tendency of, to, 30, 76, 86, 199, 235; prizes taken by, 44; scrofula, tendency of to, 150 *et seq.*, 180; skin diseases, tendency of, to, 73, 198, 214; *Training of*, Poor Law Commissioners, *Report on*, 15 *et seq.*; visited under 14 & 15 Vict., 120; under 39 & 40 Vict., 121
Working Boys, Homes for, 41, 42

YOUNG, Mr. G. F., 48
Young, Miss, 50
Young Women in Workhouses, 32 *et seq.*

ZELLE, Herr, 291 *et seq.*
Zeller, Pastor, 287

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

THE END

Printed by R. & R. CLARK, *Edinburgh.*

MESSRS. MACMILLAN & CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

A Short History of the English People. By JOHN RICHARD GREEN, M.A., LL.D., late Honorary Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford. With Coloured Maps, Genealogical Tables, and Chronological Annals. 147th Thousand. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d. Also an Edition in Four Parts; the corresponding portion of Mr. Tait's Analysis being bound up with each.

Part I. 607–1265.	Part III. 1540–1660.
Part II. 1262–1540.	Part IV. 1660–1873.
Parts I. and II., 3s. each, are ready.	*Parts III. and IV. shortly.*

History of England for Beginners. By ARABELLA B. BUCKLEY (Mrs. Fisher), Author of "The Fairyland of Science," "A Short History of Natural Science," &c. With Coloured Maps and Chronological and Genealogical Tables. Globe 8vo. 3s.

Our National Institutions. A Short Sketch for Schools. By ANNA BUCKLAND. New Edition. With Glossary. 18mo. 1s.

The Victorian Half Century. By CHARLOTTE M. YONGE. Crown 8vo. Paper Covers, 1s.; Limp Cloth, 1s. 6d.

BY LADY BARKER.

First Lessons in the Principles of Cooking. Third Edition 18mo. 1s.

A Year's Housekeeping in South Africa. Illustrated. Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Station Life in New Zealand. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Household Management and Cookery. With an Appendix of Recipes used by the Teachers of the National School of Cookery. Compiled by request of the London School Board. By W. B. TEGETMEIER, Author of "A Manual of Domestic Economy." 18mo. 1s.

The School Cookery Book. Compiled and arranged by C. E. GUTHRIE WRIGHT, Hon. Sec. to the Edinburgh School of Cookery. 18mo. 1s.

First Lessons in Business Matters. By a BANKER'S DAUGHTER, Author of "Guide to the Unprotected in Matters relating to Property and Income." Second Edition. 18mo. 1s.

Cutting Out and Dressmaking. From the French of Mdlle. E. GRAND'HOMME. With numerous Diagrams. 18mo. 1s.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.

MESSRS. MACMILLAN AND CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

Volumes I. and II. Ready, with Portraits, price 2s. 6d. each.

English Men of Action.

General Gordon. By Colonel Sir WILLIAM BUTLER. [*Ready.*

The *Athenæum* says:—"As a brief memorial of a career that embraced many momentous spheres of action, that included some of the principal military and colonial crises of the past fifty years, and that ended in a halo of transcendent self-immolation, Sir William Butler's volume is the best we possess."

Henry the Fifth. By the Rev. A. J. CHURCH. [*Ready.*
Livingstone. By Mr. THOMAS HUGHES. [*April* 1889.
Lord Lawrence. By Sir RICHARD TEMPLE. [*May.*
Wellington. By Mr. GEORGE HOOPER. [*June.*

The price of each Volume will be half-a-crown.
The Volumes named below are either in the press or in preparation:—

Sir John Hawkwood. By Mr. F. MARION CRAWFORD.
Warwick, the King-maker. By Mr. C. W. OMAN.
Drake. By Mr. J. A. FROUDE.
Peterborough. By Mr. W. STEBBING.
Strafford. By Mr. H. D. TRAILL.
Montrose. By Mr. MOWBRAY MORRIS.
Monk. By Mr. JULIAN CORBETT.
Dampier. By Mr. W. CLARK RUSSELL.
Captain Cook. By Mr. WALTER BESANT.
Clive. By Colonel Sir CHARLES WILSON.
Warren Hastings. By Sir ALFRED LYALL.
Sir John Moore. By Colonel MAURICE.
Havelock. By Mr. ARCHIBALD FORBES.

Now Ready, in Crown 8vo, price 3s. 6d. each.

"An important series of volumes on practical politics and legislation."—*Daily News.*

"An admirable idea."—*British Quarterly Review.*

"In this series the public have the means of acquiring a great deal of information which it would be difficult to find in so convenient a form elsewhere."—*St. James's Gazette.*

The English Citizen:

A SERIES OF SHORT BOOKS ON HIS RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

Edited by HENRY CRAIK, C.B., M.A. Oxon., LL.D. Glasgow.

The following are the Titles of the Volumes:—

Central Government. H. D. TRAILL, D.C.L.
The Electorate and the Legislature. SPENCER WALPOLE.
Local Government. M. D. CHALMERS.
The National Budget: The National Debt, Taxes, and Rates. A. J. WILSON.
The State in its Relation to Education. HENRY CRAIK, C.B., M.A., LL.D.
The Poor Law. Rev. T. W. FOWLE, M.A.
The State in Relation to Labour. W. STANLEY JEVONS, LL.D., M.A., F.R.S.
The State in Relation to Trade. Sir T. H. FARRER, Bart.
The State and the Church. Hon. A. D. ELLIOT, M.P.
The Land Laws. Prof. F. POLLOCK.
Foreign Relations. SPENCER WALPOLE.
Colonies and Dependencies.
Part I. INDIA. By J. S. COTTON, M.A.
Part II. THE COLONIES. By E. J. PAYNE, M.A.
Justice and Police. By F. W. MAITLAND.
The Punishment and Prevention of Crime. By Colonel Sir EDMUND F. DU CANE, K.C.B., R.E.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.

RETURN CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT

RETURN TO the circulation desk of any
University of California Library
or to the
NORTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
Bldg. 400, Richmond Field Station
University of California
Richmond, CA 94804-4698

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS
2-month loans may be renewed by calling
(510) 642-6753
1-year loans may be recharged by bringing books
to NRLF
Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days
prior to due date

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

DEC 15 1992

REC CIRC JAN 26 1993

YC 39414

GENERAL LIBRARY - U.C. BERKELEY

B000771093